

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. IX

Spring Number, 1940

No. 2

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

JAMES R. JOY

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

CHARLES K. GILBERT

JOHN W. LANGDALE

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

FREDERICK K. STAMM

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb

Carl Sumner Knopf

Harris Franklin Rall

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Umphrey Lee

Richard Roberts

Clarence Tucker Craig

Edwin Lewis

Wilbour E. Saunders

Albert Edward Day

McIllyar H. Lichliter

Luther A. Weigle

Wilbert F. Howard

Halford E. Luccock

CONTENTS

	PAGE
From the Last Supper to the Lord's Supper.....	Clarence Tucker Craig 163
The Resurrection of Jesus.....	Paul S. Minear 174
Harnessing Human Motives.....	Thomas Nixon Carver 182
The Meaning of History.....	H. Wheeler Robinson 193
Children's Ideas of Jesus.....	Adelaide Teague Case 202
Christianity as Idea and as Event.....	D. Elton Trueblood 214
A Churchmanship for Our Times.....	Edward W. Blakeman 224
A View of Europe.....	Charles C. Selecman 236
The Incompetence of Nature.....	Joseph M. M. Gray 244
Luther and Calvin: A Contrast in Politics.....	William K. Anderson 256
A Mirror for Preachers.....	John Paterson 268
Polity as a Bar to Church Union.....	Nolan B. Harmon, Jr. 279
Providence.....	Charles W. Harris 284
The Results of the Written Gospel.....	F. J. Foakes Jackson 292
William Adams Brown: A Teacher and His Times—Featured Review.....	John W. Langdale 297
Book Reviews.....	299
Bookish Brevities.....	318

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the April, 1940, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Published by

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON, D.D. Minister of Franklin Street Methodist Church, Johnstown, Pa.

EDWARD W. BLAKEMAN, D.D. Counselor in Religious Education at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

THOMAS NIXON CARVER, Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Professor of Political Economy, Emeritus, Harvard University. Santa Monica, Cal.

ADELAIDE TEAGUE CASE, Ph.D., Litt.D. Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG, D.D., Ph.D. Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

JOSEPH M. M. GRAY, D.D., Litt.D., S.T.D. Chancellor of The American University, Washington, D. C.

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., D.D. Minister of Greene Memorial Methodist Church, Roanoke, Va.

CHARLES W. HARRIS, D.D. Department of Religion, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Litt. D., D. Theol. (Strasbourg). Briggs Graduate Professor of Christian Institutions, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1916-1934. Englewood, N. J.

JOHN W. LANGDALE, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. Book Editor of The Methodist Episcopal Church.

PAUL SEVIER MINEAR, Ph.D. New Testament Interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

JOHN PATERSON, Ph.D. Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON, D.D. Principal of Regent's Park College, Oxford, England.

CHARLES C. SELBYMAN, D.D., LL.D. Bishop of The Methodist Church, resident at Oklahoma City, Okla.

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD, D.D. Chaplain, Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal.

Copyright, 1940, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

From the Last Supper to the Lord's Supper

CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG

CONTEMPORARY Protestantism has been witnessing in recent years a significant revival of interest in worship. It is by no means clear, however, that this has included an increased emphasis upon the central historic act of Christian worship. In these days of the multiplication of ecumenical gatherings, we are rather all the more conscious that the Lord's Supper is a source of division. If there is to be any hope of overcoming these differences, it must be through a fresh understanding of the origins of the rite, a period that antedates our differences. With that in view, I shall try to trace the development "From the Last Supper to the Lord's Supper."

Two difficulties face one at the outset of any study of the origins of the Christian Eucharist. The first is the difficulty of maintaining historical detachment. The investigation of historical facts should be entirely separate from the defense of contemporary ecclesiastical positions. Anyone who approaches evidence in the spirit of a litigant for any set of conclusions thereby disqualifies himself as a scientific investigator. On the other hand, it is not easy for any devout student to be completely objective about that which is very sacred to him.¹ But the secular-minded student likewise starts with his presuppositions and prejudices. The only way in which anyone can look at evidence is through the glass which the whole of his life experience has provided.

A second difficulty arises from the nature of our earliest sources of information. The Last Supper was a particular meal which Jesus ate with His disciples on a night in the month of Nisan, about 30 A. D. The Lord's Supper was the rite which was celebrated by the Christian cult community after His death and resurrection. But we have no account of the Last Supper which does not presuppose the celebration of the Lord's Supper for 20 to 50 years. We have no record from anyone who had a strictly his-

¹ When the author realizes how biased some of the judgments appear which are expressed by F. L. Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist*, S. P. C. K., 1939, it is easier for him to appreciate that others may feel the same about what appear to him as inescapable conclusions.

torical interest. We have no description which is not influenced by the cult practice of the community in which the evangelist was at home. It is inevitable, therefore, that a measure of uncertainty must surround certain details of the Last Supper.

I. There was a time when it was popular to derive the Christian Eucharist from the sacred meals of the mysteries. That is no longer the case, for current research reveals the deep roots in Jewish table customs.² All Jewish meals had religious significance, for blessings accompanied the beginning and end of each meal. In their wandering life together, Jesus and His disciples must have shared a common table many times. At these, the Master would naturally preside. However the stories of the feeding of the multitude are to be explained, at least they witness to the fact that occasionally this table fellowship was extended to include a larger group. The Eucharistic significance of these meals is clear even from the vocabulary of Mark (6. 41-43). John joins his Eucharistic discourse to this occasion, not to the Last Supper (6. 26-59). In the earliest Christian art, this scene by the lakeside is depicted more often than the disciples about the table.³

We cannot even sketch the main points of the ministry of Jesus, yet the events of His last night cannot be understood apart from His whole career. Three points are vital to bear in mind. First, His central message had been the coming kingdom of God, an essentially, but not exclusively, eschatological promise of God's redemption. Second, the most characteristic form of His teaching was that of the parable. Third, the opposition of the religious leaders had led Jesus to see that they would not permit Him to continue His work, but that His end was near.

On the night in which He was betrayed, Jesus presided at a meal with His disciples which was fraught with great significance. According to Mark it was the Passover celebration (14. 12-16), though he also indicates that it was the intention of the Jews not to kill Jesus during the Feast (14. 1-2). John is just as explicit that it was not a passover (13. 1; 18. 28). If it were not for the context which he has taken over from Mark, it would appear that for Luke also the Passover was yet to come. "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I shall

² W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford, 1925. The point of view represented by A. Loisy in *Les Mystères Païens et Le Mystère Chrétien*, Paris, 1914, is quite obsolete today.

³ C. O. Lamberton, *Themes from St. John's Gospel in Early Roman Catacomb Painting*, Princeton, 1905.

not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (22. 15). The actual account of the meal which Mark gives contains no reference to lamb, bitter herbs, unleavened bread, or other food distinctive of the Passover. While learned defenses of the Passover dating have been made by Billerbeck, Jeremias, Dalman, and others,⁴ the internal evidence in Mark itself shows that John's date is correct.⁵ The theory that the Last Supper was a Kiddush, or meal for the sanctification of the coming festival, also seems unlikely. It was a meal eaten under the shadow of the Passover season, so that Paul could write that Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed (1 Corinthians 5. 7). However, he designates the time of the meal as he does because no other characterization was possible, "In the night in which he was betrayed, Jesus took bread" (1 Corinthians 11. 23).

Paul's account in 1 Corinthians is the earliest which we possess. Mark is independent and represents a similar tradition. Matthew reproduces Mark with only slight verbal changes except in one regard. In the account of the preaching of John the Baptist, he omitted Mark's word that it was "for the remission of sins" (1. 4). As a loyal churchman, Matthew did not believe that John's baptism brought forgiveness; that came through the death of Jesus. Hence, he added the very same words to Mark's form of institution, "the blood which was poured out for many for the remission of sins" (26. 28). Since it is clear that all of Matthew's changes are simply editorial, his account has no independent value for us. John made no reference at all to any words accompanying the distribution of the food.

The chief problem of the sources lies with the text of Luke. The so-called Western text ends with the words in 22. 19a, "This is my body." The rest of verses 19 and 20 will not be found in this group of manuscripts. While there are other textual variations, the debate comes down to the question of the originality of the short text or the longer one. Though the long text still has distinguished defenders,⁶ I agree with those who hold that the short text is original. It seems much more probable that a second-century scribe would have supplied these words from 1 Corinthians than that he would have removed them from the Gospel.

⁴ Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 1924, II, pp. 812-853. J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, 1933. G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*. New York, 1929. Pp. 86-184.

⁵ The question of the date of the supper is conveniently summarized by M. Goguel in *The Life of Jesus*, New York, 1933, pp. 429-437.

⁶ M. Goguel, *op. cit.*, pp. 458-60; M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, New York, 1935, p. 209; F. G. Kenyon and S. C. E. Legg in *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, New York, 1937, pp. 272-86.

But that raises another question: does Luke give us merely his own free rewriting of Mark, or does he here represent another primitive tradition? That involves the whole problem of the sources of Luke. Though I cannot accept the Proto-Luke hypothesis,⁷ I do believe that Luke had good material to supplement Mark in his later chapters. Though many of his changes are doubtless simply a free reworking of Mark, I cannot believe that such is the case here. The account of the sacred meal did not offer a place for individual originality. Luke gives us an account which represents the tradition of some important church, possibly Caesarea, just as Mark reflects the Roman usage of his day.

We have then three accounts with which to deal: 1 Corinthians, Mark, and the short version of Luke. As already noted, all inevitably reflect current community practice. Four different ideas may be isolated from these various accounts. I shall discuss them in succession, weighing in each case the probability that it belongs to the Last Supper and not first to the Lord's Supper.

II. First, there is *the eschatological cup*. Mark and Paul have the eschatological reference at the end (1 Corinthians 11. 26); Luke puts it at the beginning. At the distribution of the opening cup came the words, "I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come" (22. 18; see Mark 14. 25). This joins directly on to two of the aspects of the ministry of Jesus which we have noted—His prophetic proclamation of the coming reign of God, and His presentiment that His own life would speedily be cut short. A banquet was one of the most frequent symbols for the new age (Matthew 22. 1-11). As the cup was passed with the customary blessing at this farewell meal, Jesus looked forward to reunion with His disciples in the kingdom of God.

Secondly, there was an action with bread. The breaking of bread was of course a necessary preliminary for eating. But Jesus accompanied that action with the words, "This is my body." In his epoch-making book on eucharistic origins, Lietzmann has rightly said that no ancient mystery rite is known from which those words could be derived.⁸ There is no explanation but that they were spoken. But what was meant by them? We have noted Jesus' habit of teaching in parables. Now, as many Old Testament prophets before Him, Jesus acted a parable.⁹ He did not ask His disciples

⁷ B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, New York, 1925, pp. 199-222, proposed that there was an early version of Luke with no dependence on Mark. The theory has considerable support in England.

⁸ H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 1926.

to eat His body, for He was very much alive in their midst. Rather, as the bread was broken for them, so would His body be broken for them. Some scholars find in this only a strong expression for the complete giving of Himself to His disciples. But it seems to me that the reference to an anticipated death is inescapable.¹⁰

Obviously, there was no very close parallelism between a death on a cross and the breaking of bread. We should remember, however, that the Jewish method of execution was by stoning, and thus far, opposition had come only from Jewish sources. It was they who made the arrest. Stoning would involve nothing less than the breaking of the body. We have, then, an acted parable accompanying the distribution of the bread, as He spoke the simple words, "This is my body." In some way, not clearly indicated, His death would be of benefit to them as would the broken bread of which they were now to partake. His death did not mean frustration for the expected kingdom of God, but in the providence of God it would be used to further its consummation.

Thirdly, there is a word about a new *diatheke*. I use the Greek word untranslated because it means both "testament" and "covenant." Even the latter translation must not be taken to signify a two-sided agreement or contract, but a free ordinance or dispensation of God. In Luke 22. 29 the verb from this stem is used, translated into English as "I appoint." In other words, the new *diatheke* refers to the coming Kingdom, the dying bequest of Jesus to His disciples. In Mark and Paul, the *diatheke* word is joined to the cup. The blood of Jesus was to seal the new covenant as the blood of oxen sealed the first in the time of Moses. But did Jesus Himself look upon His coming death so definitely in terms of sacrificial blood spilled in order to consummate a new *diatheke* which would supersede that of Exodus 24? It should be noted that the famous Jeremiah passage (31. 31) contains no hint of any sacrifice ratifying a new *diatheke*. No other teaching of Jesus is reported whereby He would set aside the Torah completely and replace it by a new one.

Some scholars believe that in the distribution of the wine, there was another acted parable; as the wine was poured out, so would His blood be poured out for them. Remembering the fondness of Jesus for pairs of parables, this would in itself not be improbable. But the wine was drunk

⁹ Ezekiel 4; Isaiah 30. 3; Jeremiah 19. 10; see also Acts 21. 11ff.

¹⁰ For the interpretation of the words at the table see G. H. C. Macgregor, *Eucharistic Origins*, 1929, and R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 1936, pp. 265-330.

rather than poured as a libation or sprinkled on an altar. We must not forget that nothing would seem more horrible in the eyes of a Jew than the thought of drinking blood. It seems probable, then, that the eschatological cup was the only one given special significance at the Last Supper. The association of the covenant idea with the cup later gave a parallel to the bread for those early Christians who had come to interpret the death of Jesus according to the analogy of animal sacrifices.

Lastly, there is *the command to repeat*. This is to be found only in Paul. Of course, all of our accounts presuppose the existence of the Lord's Supper, but that does not prove the historicity of the words, "This do in remembrance of me." Some scholars admit the insufficiency of the evidence and then take refuge in the "unspoken intention of Jesus." Obviously that does not admit of scientific discussion. I do not think that it is conclusive to appeal to the facts that Jesus was not an institutionalist and He was not anticipating a long history of the Church. Two other considerations are more weighty: (1) If our reconstruction is correct, what Jesus did on that night never could be repeated by anyone else in exactly the same sense; (2) the early Church did not in fact follow one instituted procedure, but there were two distinct types of sacred meals which were celebrated. I do not see how that could have been possible if it was understood at the beginning that there had been a definite institution.

III. This leads us to the consideration of the Lord's Supper. It was the great merit of Lietzmann's work to establish the existence of two entirely different types of celebration by his penetrating study of the early liturgies. In this conclusion he has been followed with some modifications by Brilioth, Hislop, Macdonald, and other students of the problem.¹¹ What Lietzmann calls the "Jerusalem type" was not a continuation of the Last Supper primarily, but of the table fellowship which Jesus had continually enjoyed with His disciples. Its purpose was not to celebrate a memorial of the death of Jesus, but a joyous anticipation of reunion with Him in the kingdom of God. This is witnessed in the Acts of the Apostles, the prayers in the Didache, and has influence down to the liturgy of Serapion. Lietzmann believes that Paul was the originator of the other type. Brilioth contends that it likewise goes back to the beginning. It is less important to decide between these two positions than to recognize the fundamental dis-

¹¹ Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, S. P. C. K., 1930; D. H. Hislop, *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, Edinburgh, 1935; and especially A. B. Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*, Edinburgh, 1934.

inction of type. Lietzmann suggests that the words of Paul, "I received of the Lord" (1 Corinthians 11. 23), mean that he ascribed his interpretation of the community meal to a special revelation. He was insisting upon that in contrast to the Jerusalem type, which possibly was supported by the Petrine party at Corinth.

Both types called for actual meals. That is clear from the disorders at Corinth. The Didache witnesses to the fact that there were as yet no fixed liturgies (9-10). The fact that Paul repeats the words of institution may indicate that this was not the custom at the community celebration, even in Pauline churches. If they had been repeated each week, it would not have been so necessary for Paul to remind them of what the meal should mean. However, real information on the point is lacking. Later, the liturgical phase became separated from the common meal and joined to the morning service of the word. The first witness to this change is Justin (ca. 150).¹² He and the Order of Hippolytus show the complete victory of the Pauline type at Rome.¹³ The community meal continued for some time as an agape, or love feast, but was finally discontinued as the danger of such excesses as at Corinth increased with the removal of the ritual act to the morning service of the word.

In the symbolism of a common meal a wide variety of spiritual values was found. The eschatological significance continued as long as the primitive hope persisted in the Church. It is seen in the Didache prayer, "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom (9. 4)." C. H. Dodd has noted that the Eastern liturgies retained much more reference to the kingdom of God than did the Western.¹⁴ Personally, I think that it is an emphasis which we sadly need to recover in connection with our celebration.

A brief word should be added on the interpretation of the rite as a new *diatheke* assuring the forgiveness of sins. Though Jesus never grounded forgiveness in His prospective death, Paul shows that this was part of the message of the primitive Church from very early times (1 Corinthians 15. 3). Many modern men, however, cannot help but feel that the sprinkling

¹² 1 Apol. 65, 67.

¹³ B. S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, 1934. An invaluable summary of the chief historical liturgies is given in W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, Oxford, 1936.

¹⁴ *Christian Worship*, edited by N. Micklem, Oxford, 1936. Contribution by C. H. Dodd on pages 68-82.

of sacrificial blood ratifying a solemn agreement with God belongs to a primitive and outworn level of ideas. For men accustomed to the Temple ritual, and acquainted with the Exodus story, it provided a helpful analogy. The death of Jesus superseded all such blood offerings for it was a sacrifice which God Himself had provided. But for people who have never seen an animal sacrifice and cannot believe that cult acts with blood have any bearing on man's relationship to a moral God, the question arises as to whether there is not a real hindrance here to Christian worship? Behind the imagery, however, lies the conviction which is of permanent significance; in the death of Christ there was an act of God's sacrificial love for men. The *diatheke* word registers the belief that in Christ God had done something new and final for men.

IV. In addition to these, five different meanings are prominent in the early Church. First of all, we may enumerate *thanksgiving*. Eucharist comes from the Greek word of that meaning. "To bless" and "to give thanks" are used almost synonymously in the accounts. All Jewish meals called for thanksgivings. Most of the early rituals show clear marks of Jewish influence in that the thanksgivings are for all of God's blessings, those in nature as well as in Christ. It is commonly assumed that 1 Clement 20 contains excerpts from the Roman ritual of the time. While the Hellenistic mysteries influenced the Christian rite at a later date, in the earliest period Jewish contacts are much more apparent. The breaking of bread and the passing of the fruit of the vine was a time to bless God for all of the unearned and unmerited blessings, and especially for the gift of His Son.

In the second place, the common meal signified *communion* with Christ and with His body, the Church. The fellowship meal was in itself an act of communion. It was accompanied by the "kiss of peace." From time immemorial the sharing of hospitality has meant the setting up of a bond between men. The Acts of the Apostles joins together "the fellowship" and the "breaking of bread" (2. 42). This was no ordinary bond of fellowship; it was one brought about through Jesus. The communion with one another was inseparable from communion with Him. That certainly was true with Paul. In 1 Corinthians 10. 17 he notes that we become one body as we partake of the one loaf, and that is, the body of Christ. For John, likewise, the thought of communion is paramount. Instead of recording the institution of the supper, he elaborates the allegory of the vine and its branches (15. 1-8). We all abide in Him as we partake of its fruit.

In the third place, the meal was a *commemoration* of the death of Jesus. This has become so important in our modern Western liturgies that it should be noted how relatively small a place it has in the accounts from the early Church. It is not found in Acts, John, Clement, Ignatius, nor the Didache, to mention only writings which have Eucharistic references. After Paul (and presumably Mark and Matthew) it is not found again till Justin. It should be noted that the Anamnesis in the Eastern liturgies commemorated much more than the Cross. Calvary was set in the story of God's goodness through history. We are not to conclude that the commemoration of Jesus' act at His last meal should be minimized, but we do need to see that element in proper proportion to other meanings. And we should also avoid certain dangers. The Lord's Supper is not a funeral, nor should it be celebrated in a funereal spirit. We commemorate One whom we say is alive forevermore. The Lord's Supper is an act of worship of the living God. The awakening of the memory of past events hardly rises to that level. We do not have a memorial of a dead hero, but the commemoration of the incarnation of the love of the eternal God.

In the fourth place, the Lord's Supper was early looked upon as a *sacrifice*. While that is not definitely witnessed in the New Testament, it is to be found in books as early as these.¹⁵ A clear distinction should be made between the interpretation of the community meal as a sacrifice and the interpretation of the death of Jesus in terms of sacrifice. The latter is found throughout the New Testament; since the sacrifice was once and for all, it could not be repeated (Hebrews 9. 25, 26). Likewise, it was a sacrifice offered not by man, but by God Himself, who provided expiation for our sins (1 John 4. 10). When the early Church first called the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, it was because it was their offering to God, the fulfillment of the prophecy of Malachi (1. 11) of a "pure sacrifice" in contrast to the Jewish offerings. In earliest times, the Christian sacrifice was one of prayer and praise and devoted living.¹⁶ Later, the gifts of nature in the elements which were consecrated for the meal were designated as the sacrifice. As the Lord's Supper was the occasion for the charity for the poor, it was definitely an act of self-sacrifice on the part of the worshipers. First in Cyprian in the middle of the third century do we find any clear connection with the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. Through the centuries, theologians have struggled to unite two ideas; the sacrifice of Christ as once and

¹⁵ 1 Clem. 40, 44; Did. 14. 2; also implied in Ignatius, Philippians 4.

for all; yet, each repetition of the Lord's Supper is in some sense not our sacrifice but His. Though Christians may continue to differ on this point, there should be no division on the need for a stress upon our self-sacrifice, which was the earlier form of interpretation.

Finally, there was the aspect of *Presence* and *Mystery*. That was of two general types. First, Christ was present at His table as *host*. It is interesting how many resurrection appearances are associated with eating. Most beautiful of all is the story of the walk to Emmaus. In the breaking of bread, the presence of the Master is recognized. We may not agree with Schweitzer that the earliest Christians expected the return of the Lord at some celebration of the Lord's Supper.¹⁷ But we cannot deny that very early they came to believe in His real presence as the host at their meal. If He partook with them at the common table, then was not the bread a participation in the body of Christ? (1 Corinthians 10. 14ff.)¹⁸ Was not the cup a participation in His blood?

The second type of interpretation looked upon the sacred food as the channel of divine power and grace. The Gospel of John is the primary witness to this point of view in the New Testament.¹⁹ Jesus is Himself the "bread of life"; "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him" (6. 53ff.). One should not conclude that there was benefit in the flesh apart from the words of Jesus; John has not entirely departed from spiritual conceptions, but in the Eucharistic act, with the words accompanying it, there was a real feeding upon the flesh and blood of Christ. The change from body to flesh is worthy of note. One does not eat a body; one eats flesh. Ignatius carried on the same ideas; for him the Eucharist was the "medicine of immortality," truly a mystery.

The localization of the Deity in food does not commend itself to genuine Protestants. But I believe that we do ourselves a great wrong if we neglect the mystery of the divine presence in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Some may interpret this as the separate presence of Christ and others of the God who revealed Himself to men in Christ. But is not the Lord our host who is most truly present in the ritual act? For myself,

¹⁸ Hebrews 13. 15-16; Romans 12. 2.

¹⁷ Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*, New York, 1931, p. 255.

¹⁹ The interpretation of these verses is warmly debated. Many insist that influenced by mystery ideas of the "eating of the God," Paul is interpreting the Lord's Supper in the same way. I agree with those who think that Paul meant that Christ was the host who shared the meal along with them.

²⁰ C. T. Craig, "Sacramental Interest in the Fourth Gospel," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII, pp. 31-41.

I cannot doubt it for a moment. We would do well to ponder the words of Canon Quick, "I connect divine presence objectively with a sunset, because it is divinely beautiful. In a different and more intimate manner I believe divine presence to be connected with the Eucharistic elements, because in and by them Christ is not only expressed but also acts upon me. . . . The presence resides in what is done with the elements rather than in the elements themselves."²⁰ Or we may speak with Bishop McConnell of the Lord's Table as the place of the "divinest immanence."²¹ A theory of the real presence is less important than the spiritual fact.

I have endeavored to trace the main lines of the development of the central cult act of the early Christian Church. We have seen that it was a service of worship centering about symbolism with food. It goes back to the experiences of the first disciples with Jesus, even though a deliberate institution is not to be maintained. If there was no command to do one particular thing, it is not so unfortunate that uncertainty must remain on certain details of the Last Supper. This uncertainty arises because of the great variety of experiences which came to be associated with the community meal. From the third century to our own day, however, there has been more and more concentration upon a doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and localization of the Deity in food. If I interpret the modern situation correctly, it is on these two points that Protestant thought reacts against ecclesiastical tradition.²² It seems to me that those difficulties are in some measure overcome if we get back to the earlier period. And there is a further lesson to be learned from these primitive days. If different meanings were found in the one cult act in the primitive Church, why should we today be confined to those which were developed in the first two centuries? Why should not we develop forms of worship under the symbolism of food corresponding to the different moods of today? If a revival of worship is to be living and vital, we must not only transmit the liturgical heritage of the past, but be as creative in our day as the Church was in the first century.

²⁰ O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, 1927, pp. 254, 225.

²¹ F. J. McConnell, *The Diviner Immanence*.

²² Representative denominational points of view are given in the volume edited by Headlam and Dunkerley, *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, New York, 1937, a contribution of the Faith and Order movement. Learned Roman Catholic surveys of the critical work done in the field covered by this article are given by W. Goosens, *Les Origines de l'Eucharistie*, Paris, 1931, and A. Arnold, *Der Ursprung des Christlichen Abendmahles*, Freiburg, 1937.

The Resurrection of Jesus

PAUL S. MINEAR

THE resurrection of Jesus was an historical event. As an event within history, it combined two elements, occurrence plus interpretation. As the earliest witnesses were not primarily concerned with precise scientific definitions of the occurrence, it is probably forever impossible to collect sufficient evidence to substantiate any definition of what happened. But as these witnesses were tremendously concerned with the significance of what happened, they left abundant evidence of their interpretation of the event. To be sure, the interpretations varied in accordance with the personal background and ideology of each witness. Nevertheless, there is a striking unanimity of testimony concerning the central meaning of the event itself.

To the extent that the resurrection was an event within a particular historical context and to the extent that the early Christian Church preserved the interpretations of the original witnesses, it is both possible and desirable for the historian to recover the immediate context and the ensuing interpretations. In fact, the event was of such importance that the historian of early Christianity must endeavor to understand the atmosphere and meaning of the first Easter. For apart from the experiences of the disciples the birth of the Church is inexplicable. Their experiences were epoch-making in that they marked the turning point between Judaism and Christianity, between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, between the message "The reign of God is at hand" and the message "The Lord is at hand," between the discipic and apostolic communities. If the event had such momentous implications for them, it is well for us to reconstruct their situation in order to understand the relevance of the event in which they participated.

What historical forces were operative upon and within their lives? In what cultural and religious atmosphere were they living? In what did their faith lie? What future anticipations, what crucial issues, what inner tensions, what dominant emotions characterized the immediate situation? What was at stake for them in the death of Jesus? Like every historical event, the meaning of the resurrection becomes intelligible to the degree that its rela-

tionships to its total context can be imaginatively reconstructed. Let us proceed, then, to summarize the relevant forces which demonstrably were focused in the experience of the disciples, the conditioning elements without which the subsequent interpretations of the resurrection would have been most improbable.

In the first place, the disciples were Jews. And as Jews, they were heirs of the Prophets and Psalmists, of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, of the writers and readers of Second Isaiah, Daniel, Enoch, and the Psalms of Solomon. From these cultural ancestors they had inherited a profound religious faith, founded upon the reality and power of a just and merciful God, the sphere of whose activity was the historical destiny of the covenant community. The will of this God had been comprehensively revealed in the Law and the Prophets, was continuously apprehended by the community to which they belonged, and was being executed in contemporary events. This faith was the substratum of their thought, witness and mission.

As Jews, their psychological reactions followed a pattern normal to the prophets of their race. The more profound experiences emerged from the tensions created by the impact of personal or social crises upon their faith in the validity of God's covenant. Resolutions of these tensions were sought, and often found, through the study of the Scriptures, through prayer and worship, through a new revelation of God's purpose in the very events which created the crisis. This new revelation often took the form of a symbolic vision which threw their immediate situation into a new perspective from which its positive meaning emerged.

Thus their noble religious heritage had bred in them an ability to face realistically the problem of suffering with the assurance that God's redemptive purpose could adapt all circumstance to advance His cause. Deeply ingrained was the power to transcend new disappointments by viewing them in the light of God's historical plan. Without such faith, historically oriented and empirically authenticated, the resurrection experience would have been both impossible and meaningless.

In the second place, the disciples were Jewish apocalypticists. First-century apocalypticism was the legitimate descendant of the Jewish prophets, preserving the prophetic faith by adjusting it to contemporary conditions. As apocalyptic prophets, the active life of the disciples was predicated upon the imminence of God's kingdom. This new age had become for them the goal of an all-consuming hope, the pearl for which they had sold all else.

They oriented their lives by it: in repentance, in whole-souled obedience as servants, not of Mammon, but of God. Their vocation as heralds of this Kingdom had been inspired and authenticated by convincing manifestations of the Kingdom's approach. They were convinced that the coming age had already entered into irrevocable opposition to the existing age.

Nor should we forget the perennial source of such a hope: the tension between the righteous will of a just and merciful God and the sinful will of an unjust and vengeful community; the realistic grappling with the fact of widespread injustice and the adamant faith in the covenant promises. In such crises had apocalypticism emerged in the past; in such a crisis their own hope became relevant; it was such a crisis which was accentuated by Jesus' death.

As the hope for the Kingdom rooted in their faith in God, so also their expectation of an imminent general resurrection rooted in their confidence of the Kingdom. The disciples believed in resurrection before the death of Jesus. The doctrine of a resurrection had appeared in Jewish thought as a corollary of apocalyptic hope, and had remained contingent upon the fulfillment of that hope. In every instance where the idea of resurrection appears in preceding Jewish literature, it is the expectation of a general resurrection at the end of the present age and the beginning of the kingdom of God. In every instance, the idea of individual renascence is a phase of community hope. Had the disciples not been Jewish apocalypticists, they would not have seen the Risen Lord, nor interpreted those visions as they did.

In the third place, the disciples were associates of Jesus. Through His word and work their trust in God had been invigorated. Did He not teach them to trust God completely and to serve Him without stint? Through His call and leadership their hope in the Kingdom had been intensified. Did He not convince them to seek first the Kingdom? Did He not evoke the faith that the all-powerful God was even then seeking to save a prodigal society? Did they not learn to pray "Thy kingdom come" with full confidence that their Father would not give them "a stone"? Had they not seen the things which prophets and kings had long hoped to see: the Spirit operative, the demons banished, the authority of the Kingdom manifest, the forgiveness of sins, a saved and saving remnant selected as the nucleus of the new age? Surely we are safe in concluding that Jesus' message and mission had served to articulate their faith and hope, giving to these realities new certainty, immediacy and meaning.

It is impossible to describe with completeness the influence which Jesus exerted in their lives. Nevertheless, there is evidence that He not only represented and elicited their deepest needs and fondest dreams but also inspired them with the more intangible qualities of His personality: His courage, enthusiasm, compassion for the outcast, power to heal body and mind, readiness to forgive, utter devotion, and inherent nobility of character. Did He not represent for them the righteousness which God demanded, not the legalistic slavishness of the Pharisees, but the more simple, humble, and sacrificial obedience that would characterize the members of the divine community? These personal qualities of Jesus were no doubt intrinsically significant, but their significance for the disciples must have been greatest in their bearing upon the Kingdom hope and communal faith.

Did they recognize Him before His death as the long-expected Messiah? The evidence is conflicting and decision may be withheld. But whether they thought of Him as the transcendent Son of Man of Enoch, the warlike Son of David, the Servant who would save through suffering, or as a prophetic representative of the coming age, or some blending of these concepts, they were aware that He had a unique task in preaching the good news. In Him the purpose of God was manifest. Through Him the powers of the new epoch were operating. God had already thrown down the gauge for the final battle with Satan.

The Gospels give evidence that their association with Jesus reached a peak of enthusiasm and power during the final period of His life. Their ideas achieved more unity and certainty, their emotions found more integration, more compelling became their call as prophets, more sacred became their fellowship in a common mission.

Then came the denouement. All Christendom knows the central events in the drama: the rising apocalyptic enthusiasm confronted by rising opposition; the entry into Jerusalem; the prophetic act of cleansing the Temple, signifying that the divine powers were even then challenging the apostasy of nation and priesthood; the plot to arrest Jesus; the common meal of the companions in the shadow of the Cross; the evening retreat to Gethsemane; the seizure, trial and ignominious crucifixion. The sequence of bare and cruel facts is perhaps too well-known; the inner drama, the meaning of the events to the disciples, is too little known. The crisis in the experience of Jesus is more readily grasped than the crisis in the experience of the disciples. Although the struggle of Jesus intersects that of His follow-

ers, it is primarily in terms of the latter that the visions of the Risen Lord and the subsequent interpretations are to be seen in their natural context.

To them the crucifixion was a stunning blow, made little less terrible by whatever forewarnings they may have received. With the aid of the gospel accounts, one may readily imagine the more immediate reactions: personal sorrow over the loss of a friend, remorse emerging from the contrast between what had happened and what might have been, an acute sense of bitter injustice, fear for their own future, the painful breaking of the filaments which had bound them to Him, doubt, despair, frustration.

But the numbness of personal grief was overshadowed by the effect of this catastrophe upon their faith. Jews were habitually realistic in accepting the fact of personal death. Death, as such, was no terror to them and constituted no great issue for religion. But *this* death was different. This was the death of God's chosen Servant, the present representative of the Kingdom, the one through whom the powers of the new age had been working. This event marked the strategic defeat of the new order by the most detested of Satan's agents. It undermined everything by which they lived. Everything was at stake.

For a time these emotions must have surged over them, destroying their sense of direction, their coherence of thought, their certainty of vocation. Gradually, we know not how soon, the various contending forces must have come to a focus about two inescapable poles of experience, an inescapable antithesis, which had to find some resolution. One pole of reality centered in their previous faith, hope and love. Faith in God, His reality, power, justice, mercy, trustworthiness. Hope in His kingdom, the gift which had been promised the "little flock," the nearness of which had become axiomatic. Love for their leader, confidence in His authority, integrity, righteousness, mission. But the other pole of their experience was no less real: the death of Jesus and the apparent triumph of the powers of evil. The logic of that event cut across the logic of faith, the living truth that had come to them in the person of Jesus.

Two alternatives lay before them: to surrender all those real influences which have been summarized by the terms faith, hope, and love; or, accepting the death of Jesus, to maintain those basic certainties and to reinterpret on a deeper level the divine purpose in the cruel suffering of their Master. They experienced in a way similar to Job and the Psalmists the heightened tension between divine purpose and human will, divine goodness and human

sin, divine love and human suffering. It was a problem centuries old, but a problem made unique by the unique situation in which they lived.

The tension was not easily resolved. They alternated between hope and despair, faith and doubt, love and distrust. But ultimately "the bent spring returned." The more potent realities reasserted themselves. Like the prophets they came to see that God could manifest His will even through persecution by heathen nations. Like the Psalmists they found that God could make the wrath of men to praise Him. Like Jesus they came to pray, "Not our wills, but thine be done."

What immediate happenings intervened between the death and resurrection may only be conjectured. But there is one suggestion that is both plausible and indicative of the central issues. It is probable that the Passover festival came the day after the crucifixion. Whether or not the sorrowing disciples participated in this ancestral ceremony cannot be established, but it seems likely that as loyal Jews they would hardly allow the high point of the Jewish calendar to pass unnoticed. Would not some intimation of the meaning of this sacred festival seep into their consciousness? How strangely relevant the Passover was to their own crisis: This was the time-hallowed memorial of a divine deliverance from earlier oppressions. The story of this deliverance was repeated, with hallelujahs to Him "who brought us out from slavery to freedom, from sadness to joy, from mourning to festivity, from darkness to light, from oppression to deliverance." The Passover marked the renewal of the age-old covenant with God, bringing a reassurance that God would fulfill His pledge of future deliverance. The ritual, which every disciple must have known by heart, was permeated with this forward look.

"He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
And liftest up the needy out of the dunghill;
That he may set him with princes,
Even with the princes of his people. . . .

"The cords of death compassed me,
And the pains of Sheol gat hold upon me:
I found trouble and sorrow.
Then called I upon the name of the Lord [Jehovah].

"I shall not die, but live,
And declare the works of the Lord [Jehovah].
The Lord [Jehovah] hath chastened me sore
But he hath not given me over to death. . . .

"I will give thanks unto thee; for thou hast answered me,
And art become my salvation.
The stone which the builders rejected
Is become the head of the corner."

These excerpts from the Hallel Psalms (Psalms 113-118) breathe the spirit of Jewish piety at its best, they indicate the atmosphere in which the faith of the disciples had been nurtured. May they not have had a peculiar message for the disciples at the very moment of their greatest struggle? It need not be maintained that they would have made conscious comparisons between the Passover lamb and the fate of their Master. But it may be supposed that indirectly and subconsciously this Passover feast contributed to the ferment of thought, the struggle of emotions, the conflicts of will; that it was an intangible weight helping to swing the balance from doubt to faith, from fear to trust, from defeat to determination; that it furnished patterns of thought in which the death of Jesus might be reinterpreted. At least this suggestion may help us to realize how many intimate personal influences from the previous experience of the disciples must have been interwoven at the point of crisis, helping to make it possible for the "bent spring" of faith to return.

The rebound of faith came first to Peter, perhaps in a scene pregnant with memories of Jesus. To him came a vision of the glorified Jesus, a new revelation of God's will, a new validation of faith, hope, and love. The stone which the builders rejected had become the head of the corner. God had renewed His pledge of coming deliverance. The death of Jesus had not been a chance stroke of fortune nor the victory of Satan, but the expression of the purpose of God. The Lamb had been slain, but it was the Lamb of the new covenant. Death had been necessary to the establishment of the Kingdom. It signified the real defeat of Satan, and a decisive defeat at that. It marked the choice of Jesus as the Messiah and indicated that the path to the Kingdom inevitably involved suffering. Another strategic step had been taken in the inauguration of the Kingdom, the general resurrection had begun with Jesus the "first fruit."

The vision of Jesus endorsed their faith, and this initial endorsement was progressively strengthened by all the multiple gifts of the Spirit. Their vocation was re-established, but now they were to go out as apostles of Jesus, witnesses of the Messiah. Now they knew that their community had in fact been chosen as the germ of the new society. Now the demands for

repentance and obedience, the type of life which Jesus had exemplified, became all-important. Now the mystery of the Kingdom had been revealed in terms they could not mistake.

It is manifestly impossible to comprehend in a single statement the significance of the resurrection to the early disciples. May it not be said, however, that the resurrection as an event in history within the subjective experiences of the disciples marked the triumph of the objective realities which prophetic religion has apprehended as the power of God? Who will deny that to Jesus the ultimate reality was God's love, that the first imperative was the love of God and neighbor, that the meaning of life was discovered by following the path to the Kingdom? Who will deny that to Jesus the supreme issue was the survival, not of self, but of God's redemptive purpose. The persistence of Jesus' personality would be meaningless apart from the persistence and advancement through suffering of that message and mission with which He so completely identified Himself. Such faith, such hope, such love, because it incarnates God Himself, triumphs even over the Cross. The resurrection of Jesus occurred in a particular historical context and was interpreted in the light of that context as a creative act of God. When we think again of the objective forces operating in and through the disciples' experience, without which there would have been no vision of the Risen Lord, that event does indeed become anew the revelation of God. And we can say again, the resurrection *was* an historical event, of epoch-making significance to the Christian community.

Harnessing Human Motives

THOMAS NIXON CARVER

I. THE ECONOMY OF HOPE

PLUTARCH relates that Themistocles, in a company of musicians, was forced to admit that he could not play any musical instrument—could only, were a small and obscure city placed in his hands, make it great and glorious. Whether he could make good his boast or not would depend on whether he could energize the people of his city or not, and direct their energies into those activities that build cities. This, in turn, would depend on whether he could supply them with adequate motives or not. This would not require the creation of new motives, but rather the harnessing of such motives as people have already.

The same conditions determine the success or failure of the nation builder or statesman. He will find his people adequately supplied with latent energy which only needs to be activated and directed into productive channels.

Of course the physical resources of a nation have a great deal to do with its success, but when the geographical limits are once determined, the physical resources are fixed and the statesman (nation builder) cannot do much about them. To what extent those resources are conserved and developed, and how they are used, will be determined by the extent to which the latent energies of the people become active, and how those energies are directed. Nations have remained poor in the midst of rich resources merely because their latent energies never became active, because there was no intelligent guidance, and the energies of the people were wasted in unproductive exercises.

In order that the people may be activated to productive endeavor they must be motivated. Motives can be broadly classified as prods and lures. Slaves are prodded but free men are lured into productive action. The slave economy is based mainly on fear, with hope as a secondary motive, but the free economy is based mainly on hope, with fear as a secondary motive. Economic progress is marked by the gradual disappearance of the fear economy and the emergence of the hope economy.

There are three levels of existence in which things are moved by three kinds of forces. In the lowest level, that of nonsentient, inert objects, things are moved only by physical pressure—pressure that can be measured in foot-pounds. On the next level, that of sensation, sentient objects can be moved, or caused to respond, by stimulation or irritation. On this level only actual sensation, pleasant or unpleasant, that is, actual pain or pleasure, is necessary to get a response. On the highest level, that of intelligence, anticipated sensations are almost as potent as actual sensations as motives. Anticipated sensation (the Freudian wish) rather than sensation itself is now regarded as the beginning of intelligence.

As suggested above, the anticipation of pain is the prod of fear and the anticipation of pleasure is the lure of hope. We may assume that in this country we have passed pretty well out of the fear economy and are emerging into the hope economy. We are, most of us, lured by the hope of pleasure and not prodded by the fear of violence or of want.

In this economy of hope which we are now entering there are many special lures, but the three most important are (1) the fun of working and collecting, (2) the desire to be well thought of, and (3) the desire for goods and services.

A great deal of useful work is done for the sheer fun of working. If that motive were sufficient to get everything produced that people wanted, there would be no reason for appealing to any other motive. Some people, for example, catch fish for the fun of it. If enough fish are caught for fun to supply everyone who wants them, fish become free goods. As a matter of fact they are free goods in some sparsely settled areas where the fishing is good. They are caught for fun and given freely to whomsoever will eat them.

Flowers, also, are sometimes grown for fun and given away. Where enough are grown for that reason to supply everyone, flowers are free goods. Garden truck, and even poultry products, may become free goods under the same circumstances.

One could, without great stretch of the imagination, picture a Garden of Eden as a place where everything that anybody wanted could be produced in sufficient quantity for the sheer pleasure of working. Everyone could do what he liked best to do and only as much as he liked to do, and, as a result, everyone could get everything which he wanted. But the serpent would enter that garden when that motive failed to get everything produced

that was wanted. Then some supplementary motive must be found or else some people must get along without something that they want.

There is also a widespread habit of collecting. Whether it is an inborn, squirrel-like propensity, or the result of our wearing pockets, may be open to debate. Before that debate gets very far, someone may ask why we want pockets. At any rate, there is no doubt that there are all sorts of collectors among us. If they would only satisfy their collecting propensity by collecting instruments of production, or even investible capital, we would be better equipped with aids to production.

The desire for social esteem may supply an additional motive where productive work is esteemed, but not where the successful producer is condemned. But if the fun of working, supplemented by the desire to be well thought of, both fail to get enough produced to satisfy everybody, it may be necessary to offer material rewards. When we begin offering rewards of any kind we shall very likely create some new problems. If some get larger rewards than others there may be jealousy or covetousness on the part of the less successful toward the more successful.

If productive work is rewarded by social esteem, it is pretty certain that some will get more esteem or popularity than others. This is as fruitful a source of envy as inequality of material rewards. The problem of distributive justice would be as acute in one case as the other.

However, the slogan "Distribution according to needs" could scarcely become popular. It would be difficult for anyone to argue, with a straight face, that esteem should be equally distributed or distributed "to everyone according to his need." Distribution of esteem according to merit, as the public evaluates merit, is the only possible rule. When we analyze the problem thoroughly, we may adopt the same rule for the distribution of material wealth.

II. DIFFERENTIAL GENEROSITY

An idealistic moralist may object that the system of material rewards appeals to the selfishness in human nature. This is true, but it also appeals to human generosity, that is, the desire to give to those for whom we care.

To begin with, it is no more selfish to work for material than for immaterial rewards. In the next place, we work as much for those for whom we care as for our personal selves. In the third place, there is no harm in working for those for whom we care, including ourselves, provided we give

a full equivalent in goods or services for the goods and services which we get. If everybody did that, everybody would be promoting the general interest while trying to promote his own. His so-called self-interest would be harnessed to the public good.

Generosity is as widely distributed as self-interest. Everyone cares for others besides himself and is generous toward those for whom he cares. But he cares more for some people than for others and is more generous toward those for whom he cares much than toward those for whom he cares little. *Differential generosity* is a more accurate term than selfishness or self-interest for this trait of human nature.

This differential generosity is not a sign or symptom of depravity but of finite intelligence. It is impossible for a finite mind to know every human being or to enter into the thoughts and feelings of everybody. With our limited intelligence, we can only know the interests of a limited number of people. Being ignorant of the interests of vast numbers of other human beings, widely separated from ourselves by distance, by language, religion and culture, it is mentally impossible to sympathize deeply with them, and physically impossible to do much for them.

In the economy of nature it would be wasteful of energy to try to do much for the interests of those whom we cannot understand or reach. With less waste we could do more for the interests of those whom we know intimately and can reach. We could not, if we would, do as much for our distant neighbors who are thousands of miles away as for our near neighbors. Besides, we would not, even if we could, because we could not care as much for our distant neighbors. We could not, even if we would, do as much for our very distant relatives as for our near relatives. Besides, we would not, even if we could, because we could not care as much for our distant relatives.

The word "distant," as used here, has a figurative as well as a literal meaning. When we speak of our distant neighbors, those who live a long way off, we are speaking in geographical or literal terms. When we speak of our "distant" relatives, members of other races or nationalities, not closely related to ourselves, we are speaking figuratively, but in language that is well understood. We may also use the word "distant" to represent widely different languages, religions or cultures.

Sometimes, of course, these different concepts of "distance" counteract one another. Thus, our near relatives may live halfway round the

world. We may care intensely for them in spite of the geographical distance which separates us. They are near in kinship, though distant in space. In spite of these seeming contradictions, it is still possible to say that we care more for those who are near to ourselves in space, in time, in kinship, in language, in religion or in general culture than for those who are widely separated from us in these particulars. Our generosity follows the same rule. Only infinite intelligence could care equally for all creatures, or be equally generous toward them all.

We human beings might as well accept our limitations and order our lives accordingly. To blame ourselves for not caring equally for all human beings can lead only to morbidity.

Modern means of communication and transportation make it possible, of course, for us to widen the circle of our interests. We can know and reach more people than our ancestors could and we can and do, therefore, help those who are farther away geographically. But our capacities for friendship are still limited and we have not completely annihilated space. Differential generosity is therefore still the term that accurately describes and must continue to describe our attitude toward others.

III. MOTIVES ARE NEITHER GOOD NOR BAD

No engineer will waste time arguing whether physical forces are good or evil. As forces they are neither. Any force, neglected, misdirected, or abused, may do vast harm to human beings. Any force, understood, controlled, and wisely directed, may do vast good.

There is no reason why moralists should waste time arguing whether human motives are good or evil. As motives, they are neither. Any motive, without exception, may do vast harm if uncontrolled or misdirected. The same motive, wisely controlled or directed, may do vast good.

The love of woman, for example, may incite to crime. It may also incite to noble and heroic deeds. *Cherchez la Femme* is an expression which implies that there is a woman mixed up in every crime. A misogynist, seizing upon that idea alone, might declare the love of woman to be the root of all evil. He would not be much further wrong than the man who made a similar remark about money. The desire for money or the things money will buy, may and does drive men to crime, but the same motive also drives men to hard and useful work.

Even religious zeal has sometimes driven men to persecute heretics or devotees of other religions, but religious zeal is not evil. It has also stimulated beneficent work. It does good when wisely directed toward good ends. Like a physical force, its apparent goodness consists in the possibility of being directed toward useful work. It does good when it drives men to good work, it does evil when it drives them to harmful work. In other words, it *is* neither good nor evil in itself, but it *does* good or evil according to how it is directed.

If we will stop talking and wrangling about good motives and evil motives, and imitate the engineer by considering how motives may be directed toward useful work, we shall begin to make moral, social and economic progress.

IV. MOTIVES MAY BE HARNESSSED

The more intensely one desires goods and services the harder he will try to get them for those for whom he cares. But unrestrained by law or morals, he may try to get them by violence or fraud. The man of violence, whether he be dictator, duelist, highwayman, racketeer or saboteur, tries to get what he wants by making others afraid to refuse his demands. He may even be able to say, disingenuously but without appearance of shame, that he does not want violence, that he only wants his victim peacefully to accede to his demands. If the victim refuses, he, the victim, is responsible for any violence which may ensue!

The man of fraud, whether he be a counterfeiter, forger, adulterator of goods, demagogue, or common swindler, tries to get what he wants by deceiving other people. The man of fraud, low as he is, is yet one grade higher than the man of violence. He tries to win by the exercise of his wits rather than by brute force.

Germanic folklore pictures Reynard the Fox as waging a war of wits against the bigger and stronger brutes who were bent on his destruction. Bre'r Rabbit plays the same rôle in Negro folklore. Both characters are understood to epitomize the early history of the human race. Surrounded by fierce and powerful brutes and destructive physical forces, man's only chance of survival was to outwit them. It was a long struggle of mind against physical power.

While we all realize that both Reynard and Bre'r Rabbit were

scoundrels, we are all on their side. They were clever scoundrels and we are glad to hear or read of their victories over brute force. Unfortunately we sometimes admire the clever human scoundrel and may even imitate him.

There is a later and higher struggle than that of mind against matter which, alas, has not yet progressed in our literature much beyond the stage of melodrama. That is the struggle of virtue against vice, of production against predation. The use of either violence or fraud as means of acquisition is predation.

The next stage above fraud is persuasion. They who try to get what they want by the art of persuasion, whether they be litigants before courts, candidates for office or for the hand of a lady, salesmen, advertisers or propagandists, provided they do not resort to deception, are at least harmless and may be very useful.

The last and highest stage is production. He who tries to get what he wants by giving others what they want is benefiting others as well as himself. The more intensely he desires things for himself and for those for whom he cares, the harder he will try to produce what others want. His self-interest or differential generosity is harnessed to the general good. While trying to get good things for those for whom he cares much, he is led to produce things for other people for whom he cares very little.

Left entirely to themselves, men will try to get what they want by any or all of the four methods just described. They will use their powers of destruction, of deception, of persuasion and of production. The predatory methods of violence and fraud, destruction and deception, are just as "natural" as persuasion and production.

But violence and fraud weaken the nation in proportion as they are widely practiced. Any nation that hopes to grow in strength or prosperity must suppress those predatory methods. When they are suppressed, the individual who wants something must get it peaceably and without fraud. He must either produce it himself or get it from someone else with that person's intelligent consent. In that case, the individual's self-centered motive is harnessed to the public interest. The more people there are trying to acquire wealth in these ways, and the harder they try, the better it will be for the whole country.

When violence and fraud are effectively repressed, Adam Smith's famous dictum comes true. Men are then led "as by an invisible hand" to promote the general interest while trying to promote their own. Their

self-interest, if one insists on using that term, is harnessed to the public good.

Let us consider next the fun of working. This is merely a phase of joy in action. But joy in action may be had in predation as well as in production. Or it may waste itself in sport, for sport carried to excess becomes dissipation rather than recreation. It needs to be harnessed to productive work.

The desire for social esteem is easily perverted until it becomes vanity which, in turn, may incite to crime. Dueling was once almost compulsory upon those who desired to be well thought of. To refuse a challenge was to be branded as a coward. Boys sometimes seek the admiration of their fellows by committing petty crimes, and grown-ups do the same on a larger scale. Like joy in action the desire for social esteem needs to be harnessed to productive work. It will be so harnessed when the public begins to think and speak well of all those who do useful and productive work, and to disparage all who do not.

It is well known that a highly esteemed calling will attract workers even though the pecuniary rewards are small. That is one reason why teachers and preachers are poorly paid in material goods. Part of their reward is in immaterial goods. It is not unreasonable to suppose that if enterprisers were well thought of, instead of being maligned, their profits would be lower. If they are ill spoken of, fewer will be attracted, and profits will have to be higher in order to attract talent into business.

This leads us to consider the profit motive. As a motive, it is neither better nor worse than the wage or salary motive. Profits are all the independent business man has to live on. His income is not contractual but *contingent*—contingent upon there being something left from the proceeds of his business after everybody else is paid off. Salaries, wages, interest and rent are *contractual*, but profits are contingent.

If any income is more respectable than another, profits have the first claim to that position. The independent business man contracts to pay all the other incomes, but no one contracts to pay him anything. Yet, without him, we should have to turn all business over to politicians. They can run a business so long as there is somebody to tax to make up the deficits, but when there is no one left to tax, wages and salaries would suffer.

It is true, of course, that men may seek profits in harmful industries and by harmful means, but that is equally true of every form of income.

Suppose we agree for the sake of argument, that the liquor business is harmful rather than beneficial. Whom do we blame for the harm done? If labor produces all wealth it produces all liquor. If labor produces all liquor it produces all the harm that liquor does. If that were true, labor is to blame. But we lay the blame on the man who runs the business for profit.

If, now, we were convinced, as some seem to be, that liquor is beneficial rather than harmful, the question arises, who is to receive the credit for the good that liquor does?

If we cannot admit that liquor does any good, let us take shoes. If the business man who receives profit is to blame for all the harm done by a harmful product, should he not have at least a part of the credit for the good done by a useful product like shoes? Even the profit motive can be harnessed to the public good by suppressing all violence and fraud. Selling harmful products by extolling them as beneficial, is fraud.

Then there is the competitive spirit. It may become rivalry in destruction or rivalry in the performance of service. That there is a competitive spirit is pretty well shown by our amusements. It is difficult for the average man to amuse himself without some form of competition. It would be difficult to attract tens of thousands to a stadium to see twenty-two men co-operate on the gridiron, or to see two bruisers co-operate inside the ropes. This competitive spirit, like differential generosity, joy in action, or the desire for esteem, may waste itself in destructive ways, or it may be harnessed to productive work.

There are certain high idealists, however, who contend that competition is in itself evil; that it is contrary to the Golden Rule. The competitive spirit, like other incentives, is neither good nor evil. It may drive men to evil deeds or to good deeds. One who believes that it is inherently evil should never play croquet.

It is well to remember that there is nothing in our laws or institutions to prevent co-operation. It is permitted as freely as competition. If there is more competition than co-operation, it is presumably because men like competition better. They like it either because it is more fun or because it works better. To make co-operation more general will require coercion. Men must be forbidden to compete, or compelled to pay taxes to support co-operation. It does not seem able to stand alone.

Before we decide to abolish all competition it will be well to consider just what that would mean. Democracy itself is competition. It involves

balloting, elections, running for office, campaigning for causes, and propaganda. After we have abolished competition in industry we may find that we have only jumped from the frying pan into the fire. When every position is a government job, everyone's advancement will depend upon politics. If there are no private jobs, the fate of the man with no aptitude for politics will be unfortunate. It will then be necessary, if we are to get rid of all competition, to abolish democracy and turn the government over to an absolute and hereditary monarchy.

Instead of trying to get rid of competition it would seem wiser to harness the competitive spirit to productive work. When men compete in production there is more produced. If, however, they are permitted to compete in destruction or deception there is less produced.

We come, finally, to the gambling spirit. Even it may be harnessed. That there is such a spirit is evidenced by the prevalence of gambling on every side. An evolutionist would say that for many thousands of years men had to live dangerously. They who faced danger courageously, but intelligently, survived, generation after generation. We are their progeny and we have their spirit.

It is still true that there is risk in every productive enterprise. The farmer takes risks when he plants a crop. Unless someone had the courage to take such risks we should all starve. It is not called gambling merely because it is a necessary risk. The risk-taking spirit is, like all other motives, neutral. When wasted in unnecessary risks it is at least useless. As a waste of a human quality, it may be said to be harmful. But when harnessed to useful work it is beneficent.

When productive enterprise is discouraged and real enterprisers are repressed, the risk-taking spirit breaks out in new or useless forms. It is perverted to a base misuse called gambling. If this spirit can be directed into productive fields we shall have many new enterprises started. Many will, of course, fail, but if one out of ten, or one out of a hundred, succeeds, we shall be making progress.

That is the way of all progress. Variation and selection in biological evolution, trial and error in laboratory experiments, cutting and fitting in designing new mechanical models, indefatigable experimentation in invention—these all call for a large infusion of the gambling spirit. So also does the starting of a new industry. Where there is enough of this spirit directed toward production, there are more and more new industries, more

and more new goods for more and more people and more and more jobs for workers. Repress enterprise, make it more and more difficult for a new enterprise to succeed because of heavier burdens and more restrictions, cast more aspersions on profits of enterprise, and we shall have more and more foolish gambling, fewer goods and fewer jobs.

Our conclusion is that we have motives enough and they are good enough to bring endless progress if they can be harnessed to production rather than to predation. We don't need a new set of motives. What we need to do is to harness such motives as we have.

The Meaning of History

H. WHEELER ROBINSON

BUT has history a meaning? In these perplexing days, when so many landmarks, spiritual as well as material, are being destroyed, the thoughts of men are often summed up in Matthew Arnold's well-known lines:

"we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

We are no longer sure that history spells progress. We see what were regarded as established values challenged and apparently overthrown. The confusion of the present throws doubt upon the conclusions of the past.

It is clear enough that we can interpret history only when we rise above it. Alongside of Arnold's "darkling plain" we may set the famous simile of Lucretius. Above the tumult of the warring legions, with all their confusion of detail, there is some spot on the high hills from which they are blended into the unity of one flashing point. The Christian interpretation of history finds its viewpoint on the hill of Calvary. But the paths leading up to it were those trodden by the prophets and apocalypticists of the Old Testament. These men were unique in the ancient world in tracing the ordered purpose of God in the happenings of history. The peculiar quality of a historical revelation depends on such interpretation. The Christian view of the world completes what they began. To attempt any formulation or defense of it here is beyond our scope. But it may be worth-while to ask, in general terms, what are its axioms.

There are at least five characteristics of history which the Christian interpretation of it claims to discern. These are (1) its creative activity, (2) its actuality, (3) the intrinsic authority of its values, (4) its inner transvaluation of meanings, and (5) the inclusion of its temporal events within an eternal order.

I

History is the sphere of *creative activity*. Something is doing, all the time, and whether it be for good or for evil. As we walk along some little street, a negligible item in a negligible city, imagination can picture a

score of human dramas behind the walls of its houses, all different, yet all alike in creating something vital, something of far-reaching importance to its actors. Birth and marriage and death, the family fortunes and interests, the laughter and the tears, the business cares and the domestic worries, the fine heroisms and the shameful surrenders, the patient self-sacrifices and the sordid selfishness—all these are creating something, something that matters, and matters for history as well as for the joy or sorrow of the moment. What, indeed, is history but the gathering up of these men and women into the destinies of nations, the ambitions of rulers, the persuasions of prophets?

If all this activity is to have moral and spiritual meaning, it must spring from a certain measure of real freedom. Not an unmeasured freedom, except in the brief dream of ardent youth. We are prisoners to the walls of our chromosomes as well as to those of our education and social environment. But within the assigned limits, there is plenty of scope for the greatest issues of life. The greater the issues, the more shall we find them "in widest commonalty spread," and accessible to the greatest number. The common sisterhood "under their skins" of "the Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady" is matched by a common freedom to create something that matters out of their very different circumstances.

There is joy and dignity in the creation of something worth-while. It is the expression of an inner self seeking to justify its existence in its own eyes and in the eyes of others. To plow a straight furrow, to make a strong chair, to save a life by skillful surgery or a nation by wise statesmanship—all these enhance the quality of life for the doer himself. One of the pure pleasures of life is honest pride in a job well done. But creative activity means more than that. It means also the reality of fellowship with God, the Creator of the world. So much talk about fellowship with God is sheer sentimentality. It is like trying to tighten a nut with a broken thread, for it never bites on the realities of life. But whether a man is conscious of it or not, he cannot be a creator of anything good without being ranged up in his own degree with God, made more able to think God's thoughts, and walk in God's ways. He gets to God from the inside of his job, and that is far better than any merely conventional approach.

The Christian interpretation of history sees in all this creative activity the continuation of God's own creative work. The work is man's, but it is also God's, in the mystery of His comprehension of our freedom within

His will. We can hardly put it better than in the words of Thomas Traherne,¹ that when God had done all He could in the exercise of His own liberty, He did more by creating man's. For it is from this characteristic of creative activity belonging to human history that all the other characteristics spring.

II

By the *actuality* of history we mean primarily its "once-for-allness." When an event has taken place, it is irrevocable in itself, even though some of its consequences may be reversed by another event. So far, there is no place for repentance, even though we seek it with tears. When Julius Caesar "actually" crossed the little stream called the Rubicon between Cisalpine Gaul and Italy, he was declaring war with Pompey. He might have withdrawn again into his own boundaries, but that would not have canceled the actuality of the event. Such an event may, of course, be purely psychical; indeed, the most important events of history are often those inner decisions, like the conversion of Saint Paul or Saint Augustine, which profoundly modify the course of history. Bunyan was not mistaken when he regarded his wholly inner decision to "sell Christ" as an event of cardinal importance in his spiritual history.

Another important aspect of this actuality, especially when it takes the form of an outward and visible event, is that it clarifies the ideas of the agent and of his contemporaries. Before the inner decision is made, or the outer act is done, there may be a number of possibilities more or less undefined. The man who is about to make the decision may be drawn this way and that; but once he has made it, with any fixity of purpose, and still more when he has registered his decision in the visible act, all possibilities save this one are excluded, and a new situation must be envisaged, with the new factor in it of *this* event. The event may be such as to epitomize history. The medieval conflict between Church and State finds its classical expression in the excommunication of Henry the Fourth of Germany by Pope Gregory the Seventh, and in the diplomatic penitence of the king, when he stood barefoot for three days before the gates of the castle of Canossa. But the same principle holds of some trivial incident in a humble cottage, unforget-
gotten as the crisis in the relations of husband and wife, of father and son. The spoken word or the visible deed may clarify a situation for good or for

¹ *Centuries of Meditations* (IV. 46).

evil to the speaker or doer himself, as nothing else could. So it is in the process of literary composition. The struggle of the author to capture an elusive thought issues in the sentence or phrase which fixes that thought, and projects it into a history of its own. The author escapes from the penumbra of vague groping, and knows what he knows; he discovers how "woolly" was his thinking by the very effort to give it a sharp and clear-cut outline. So it is with every deed; the definition by the actuality of the event greatly helps to clarify the thought of it.

But the chief reason why the actuality of the event can be rich in meaning is that the conscious act of a moral agent in some pivotal event requires the exercise of volition. It is a far fuller expression of personality than purely intellectual activity and its resultant abstractions can ever be. Of course, intellectual activity may itself be the product of volition of an intense kind, and is itself thereby an "event." But we are not thinking now of the student or the statesman revolving high theses of philosophy or politics as part of his lifework. We are thinking of the plain man, and of the difference for him of thinking about something to be done, and of actually doing it, perhaps at the cost of some resolute effort of will. There is far more of the man himself in the deed than in the thought of the deed. Thought is necessarily an abstraction from life, and life is always more concrete than any analysis of it by thought. The records of history are concerned with the deed, by which alone the hidden thought is revealed to us. The greater wealth of expression in the deed is well brought out by what are called the "symbolic acts" of Hebrew prophets. These are much more than dramatic illustrations of the spoken word. They are products of the instinctive realism of the Hebrew, which made him regard even the spoken word as a deed, and made him strive for some fuller expression of his thought than the spoken word could supply. The breaking of earthenware by the prophet Jeremiah in independent parallelism with his prophecy that Jerusalem would be broken was more than a dramatic illustration. It liberated more of the prophetic personality than did the accompanying word, and was conceived to initiate the divine activity. The theologian does well to employ this principle in his approach to the sacraments of the New Testament and to the Incarnation itself. Both are so much more than the expression of a thought, because both possess the actuality of the event.

All that has been said illustrates and leads up to the truth that in the actuality of the event we have a new category, a unique articulation of

spiritual reality, not to be reduced to any intellectual formula. But though we cannot hope to define this category by anything less than itself, since it has the texture of life, we can parallel it to some degree from the realms of art. To create the beauty of a picture or the majesty of a statue or the symmetry of great music is to add a new quality to the conception of the artist or sculptor or composer. The new creation constitutes a language of its own, which defies translation even into the sister arts. So it is with that supreme creative activity which is manifest in the lives of men, and in the history which gathers up those lives into its unity of meaning. We can no more reduce their utterance to a series of propositions than we can so reduce artistic creation. That, we may claim, is why the Bible can still maintain a supreme and unique place among the sacred books of the world. It is pre-eminently a historical revelation, which means that in it God has used the richest and fullest of all the categories of expression known to us, that of human life.

III

Another aspect of the creative activity of history is seen in *the emergence of moral and spiritual values*. These are not due to a series of arbitrary interventions from without in a process essentially alien to them. Aesthetic, intellectual, moral and religious values are integrally related to the whole process in which they gradually appear. We can often discern the point at which civilization first becomes conscious of them, as in the classical standards of Greek art and philosophy, of Hebrew morality and religion. In this, human history resembles biology, where the functions of higher organisms can usually be traced to rudimentary beginnings.

An illustration may be drawn from architecture. The Greek column, the Roman round arch, and the pointed arch known as "Gothic," are all methods "of solving the first problem of architecture, how to build a roof over a given space."² Thus the severe dignity and grace of a Greek portico, the massive solidity of a Roman chancel, the soaring lines of a Gothic nave, are all "values" slowly evolved from the simple necessity of roof-making.

The same principle holds of the development of moral relations. The ethical demands of the New Testament are rooted and grounded in the social conceptions of the great Hebrew prophets, and these themselves go

² E. A. Greening Lamborn, *The Story of Architecture in Oxford Stone*, p. 15.

back to the social life of nomadic clans, whose very existence depended on the social unity of the group. Justice and mercy—the twin pillars of Hebrew as of Christian morality—are raised on the foundation of the desert life of Israel. By recognizing such *origins* we are not foreclosing the issue as to the ultimate *source* of morality in God. We are thinking only of the process by which man has grown into the knowledge of something greater than himself and his individual interests. The loftiest idealism is cradled in the crudities of a primitive realism.

The highest values of all, those of religion, afford no escape from history save through history. The claim of the mystic to enjoy immediacy of access to the divine owes any value which the content of his experiences may possess to the conscious discipline or the unconscious appropriation of the achievements of past generations which he inherits. The fierce simplicity of the formula of Islam, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is His prophet," is explicable only in the light of a long development of Semitic religion and the personal fortunes of a particular Arab. The ecumenical creeds of Christendom that gather the reverence of the centuries conceal within their closely wrought and subtle phraseology the strife and conflict, noble or ignoble, of men of like passions with ourselves. From beginning to end this has been God's way of revealing His truth. History is creative of its own values, and utters the divine blessings and cursings through the mouths of its own children.

Idolatry is the antithesis of true religion, because, as has been well said, it "is the denial of the principle of growth."³ To cling to the forms of a value that has been transcended, is to make for the graven image those silver chains that bind it to its place.⁴ The living God is continually being revealed anew in the life of history and refuses to be taken captive.

From all this it follows that the authority possessed by these values is intrinsic. They have demonstrated it sufficiently by being what they are. They have survived by their continued ability to hold the loyalty of men. We receive them in the tradition of the race, by a sort of *consensus gentium*. This should always have our respect, though not our unquestioning allegiance. There are classical achievements in art, elaborate interpretations of the universe in philosophy, national histories that demonstrate in the long run the futility of substituting force for fellowship. There is the Christian

³ Claude Houghton, *The Kingdoms of the Spirit*, p. 26.

⁴ See *Isaiah* 40. 19.

society to witness, however imperfectly, to the Gospel of Christ. But neither academy nor university nor State nor Church can ever be more than secondary authorities, in comparison with the ultimate authority of God, that is, of God revealed in the values created in the course of the history which He controls. On His behalf, they make their intrinsic appeal to us, and win from us the intuitive response of the whole personality in faith. It is they that give the real content to our conceptions of God.

IV

The supremacy of the psychical factor in history, to which we owe these values, is further seen in its *transvaluation of meaning*. From the very outset, the meaning of an event is conditioned by the relation and attitude toward it of those whom it concerns. Meaning is always meaning for someone. The first reporter of the event, who provides the raw material of history, has already modified it by his particular reaction to it. Subsequent writers or readers of history always supply their own interpretation. There is no such thing as a complete objectivity of record or interpretation, or perception. The unity of consciousness, in all its activities, includes the duality of the subjective and the objective.

This fact has a most important bearing on the ultimate meaning of history. If there is no objective fixity in the interpretation of the event, and its meaning varies with the varying attitude of those whom it concerns, then the "fact" constituted by event plus meaning is not itself irrevocably fixed, as is the "bare" event (a pure abstraction). The meaning of history, however unalterably constituted on the side of its past events, is not finally reached until we know the final attitude to it. Thus, to a man reviewing his own past, that past will have different meanings, and so different values, at differing periods of his life. A transformation of attitude may profoundly alter, not the imagined "bare event," but the "fact" of the interpreted event. That which is true of such an individual fragment of history as belongs to biography must also be true of larger and longer retrospects. The actuality of history remains, but, in the sense here indicated, side by side with its potential transformability, its "transvaluation." Just as in Taine's epigram, "the chief person in a picture is the light in which everything is bathed,"⁵ so the ultimate meaning of history, racial and individual, will depend upon our final attitude toward it.

⁵ As quoted by John Rothenstein, *Nineteenth Century Painting*, p. 157.

I need not do more than suggest the importance of all this for evangelical religion. On the one hand, it gives rational support to the religious demand for conversion and repentance; a changed attitude can transvalue inexorable penalty into necessary and accepted discipline. On the other hand, it opens up the prospect of a redemption of history, not simply by the ultimate conversion of its individual members, here or hereafter, from evil to good, but also by the transvaluation of its events, as in the supreme and central example of the transvaluation of the Cross of Christ in the minds of the disciples.

V

The final axiom for the Christian interpretation of history is the inclusion of the temporal in the eternal. This ultimately philosophical problem is approached by Christian faith through three dualities, namely, that (a) history must vindicate God, and yet is inadequate within itself to do this; (b) the values of history requiring a temporal order for their actualization also require an eternal order for their interpretation and justification; (c) the temporal must be so taken up into the eternal that its process as well as its product have meaning and value for both God and man.

In regard to the first of these, no man can labor whole-heartedly and unselfishly for a cause in which he does not believe. But such belief implies that the cause will ultimately win, because the universe is on its side. A man may be ready to fling down his life for his cause, so that the cause may win without him, but it must win at last. Somewhere and somehow, *magna est veritas et praevalet*. But such a vindication would not be adequate if it meant simply a final achievement reached, in the actual course of history, as its goal. Berdyaev has forcibly reminded us that enthusiasm for the religion of progress is hardly to be stimulated by the prospect of "a consummation celebrated by the future elect among the graves of their ancestors."⁶ Our greatest values are so bound up with an individual consciousness that they cannot be vindicated impersonally, while that consciousness is extinguished. To explain and justify history, we must go beyond history.

In the second place, it is indeed the struggle to attain and maintain these values that gives them reality. We can hardly be sure of our own sincerity until we have sacrificed something on its altar. The spiritual must be embodied to become real to us. The eternal must take temporal form

⁶ *The Meaning of History*, pp. 190, 197.

to enter our horizon at all. Yet we cannot interpret these values without referring them to an eternal order. We do not of ourselves, after all, so much "create" as "discover" them. A common characteristic of beauty and goodness and truth is that they are somehow already there when we stumble or struggle into them. Their evident authority over us implies that they are more than ourselves, and that they have their eternal home in Personality greater than our own. With this Personality lies the initiative; "we love, because He first loved us."

The third demand, namely, that for the inclusion of the temporal within the eternal, brings us to the threshold of the ultimate problem of philosophy. How can an event in time be also above time? All that can be said here on that great issue is that the Platonic symbolism, which tends to reduce time to the shadow of eternity, is inadequate for the Christian faith, notwithstanding its great Christian adherents. Our emphasis on the actuality of history commits us to the belief that time is not the symbol, but the instrument, of eternity. With this conception, the temporal can be seen as the partial revelation of the eternity to which it belongs. The real difficulty here is how to evaluate a dynamic process in terms of an already existent eternal order. The deepest conviction of the saint is that he is entering, after long and arduous struggle, into a realm that already exists for God. What the human experience adds to God's unlimited wealth of being and purpose must consist in the actuality of its expression. But this actuality, conceived as due to a human freedom exercised *within*, and not simply parallel to, the activity of God, will constitute a new category, which can claim its place as a positive enrichment of the created universe. It is higher in value than all the results of divine activity in sun and moon and stars and the immensities and intricacies of Nature, just because it involves the exercise of finite, but real freedom, within the comprehensive purpose and activity of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Children's Ideas of Jesus

*A Report of Sixty-two Interviews With Boys and Girls
From Nine to Twelve Years Old*

ADELAIDE TEAGUE CASE

“JESUS was the son of Moses and wrote the Ten Commandments.”

“Once He cured thirteen men and only twelve thanked Him, so He gave the man back his disease. And when He was small He made a speech for the priests. His father lost Him in the Temple and they went away, but Saint Joseph got Him and they went away in the night time to Egypt.”

“He united the Jews, the Mohammedans, and the Christians.”

These remarks, made by children in conversation with older friends, might well lead us to question the effectiveness of some of our teaching about the central figure of Christianity, our Lord Jesus Christ.

In an effort to throw light on the problem a number of workers in religious education have been holding informal interviews with boys and girls from nine to fifteen years old. All interviews followed the same general pattern. Certain specified questions on the life of Jesus were agreed upon,¹ but it was understood that with these as a framework opportunity would be given for additional questions, questions on the children's part, explanations and discussion. The interviewer had pen and paper before him and kept a verbatim record of the conversation.

There was no want of co-operation. The children entered readily into the investigation. When they realized that grades and standing were not involved, most of them spoke with no apparent constraint. Of an eleven-year-old girl the leader notes: “Madge was at ease and answered freely. She was interested in talking with someone about her religious views. It seemed as if she opened up and talked more intimately than I have ever known her to, and I see her nearly every day of the week.”

Sixty-two reports of these interviews are before me. More than half of them (32) are from boys and girls thirteen and fourteen years old (7 boys and 12 girls of thirteen, 6 boys and 7 girls of fourteen). One boy of fifteen

¹ The questions will be found on the last page of this article.

and 3 fifteen-year-old girls were interviewed. There were 7 boys and 19 girls from nine to twelve. Age variations influenced the character of replies very little indeed. There is no conspicuous advance with age in either information or understanding. But it must be remembered that this was not a statistical study. No attempt was made to keep certain factors constant. This group was not sought as in any sense "representative." Nevertheless, the results of the interviews are well worth considering for what they tell of these particular boys and girls who co-operated. The question as to how far our findings are true for other groups or for boys and girls in general, or under certain circumstances, remains yet to be answered.

The first question suggested, *How long ago did Jesus live?* proved surprisingly baffling. Only about a third of the group answered it correctly. "I haven't any idea. Gosh, this is terrible, I'm so ignorant. And I studied the life of Christ last year—supposedly." This from Nancy, fifteen years old, and a steady attendant in Sunday school from kindergarten up. Ten others were quite unable to give any answer. "Oh, since the world began," replied Jean, twelve years old, in the seventh grade. "Well, maybe a little later than that, a little later than Adam and Eve." Six replied, "A thousand years ago"; 3, "Five hundred years ago"; two children—a boy of ten and a girl of eleven—thought it was a hundred years ago. Other interesting answers were, "As long as history," and, from a fourteen-year-old boy, "During the Middle Ages He was crucified."

About two thirds of the children knew that the gospel story gives Bethlehem as Jesus' birthplace. To the question, *Where was He born?* 44 answered "Bethlehem," 9 "Jerusalem," 6 "Nazareth," and 3 did not know or failed to answer. The question, *In what country did He live?* was much more difficult. "Oh, He lived all over," said one child fifteen years old, and another, a Catholic girl of thirteen, replied, "He was born in Bethlehem—that is in Israel—but He traveled a lot in Egypt and in Rome." One interviewer reports this conversation with a twelve-year-old Chinese-American girl, in the seventh grade, living in a Protestant children's home:

Where was He born? "Bethlehem." *Do you know anything about Bethlehem?* "No." *Did you hear about it?* "Yes, in Sunday school, but I don't pay any attention to it." *In what country did He live?* "Here in America." (Another child insisted that the crucifixion was in Mount Vernon!)

The same girl remarked, "I don't know very much about Jesus." When asked if she attended Sunday school, she said, "Yes, every Sunday." *What*

do you do in Sunday school? "The teacher read a story about Jesus, but I did not pay any attention. Sometimes she talked about herself when she was young. She told us that she liked to make hats when she was young."

Only 23 out of the 62 said that Jesus lived in Palestine; 14 gave "Jerusalem" as their answer, 5 "Egypt," 3 "Judea," 3 "Nazareth." The other answers were scattered and included, "Over there near Egypt," "Arabia," and "Capernaum."

There is obvious need for these boys and girls to place Jesus Christ more clearly in His time and place. One wonders what, if any, relation they found between their New Testament studies and their work in history and geography in day school. Is "Bethlehem" just a word in a Christmas carol? Have they thought of Jesus' life on earth in relation to the *time-lines* (showing graphically the sequence of great historical events) which are now so popular in textbooks and school rooms?

The question, *What were the most important things that Jesus did in His life?* brought replies that seem to show a general realization of His helpfulness rather than a vivid impression of specific acts. The most frequent responses were that He taught, mentioned 29 times, or healed the sick, mentioned 26 times, or both taught and healed. "He taught people about God and healed people." "Healing the sick and teaching the disciples about God." "Teaching, I expect, and healing; that was about everything that He did." "He was a Christian doctor because He healed the sick." "He taught people how to worship God."

Jesus' work was very seldom referred to as the development of a group of disciples. Only four or five answers suggest this. One boy of thirteen said, "He was the founder of Christianity," and a girl of thirteen, a Catholic, "He taught people to worship God and gave them the means of worshiping in the Church." No one said, "He showed us what God was like." Only a few suggested as important actions, "Enduring a cruel death," and no one said, "Eating the Last Supper with His disciples." That He defied the conventions of the day and that He changed the whole outlook of individuals do not seem to have been very vigorously taught.

Some of the more specific statements reflect a fine appreciation of our Lord's character. Here are a few of them:

"He cared for babies and He went around curing the sick and blind. He liked to help people. He went to a wedding and changed water into wine and helped them out." (Boy, 9.)

"He taught about the kingdom of God. He helped those who needed it, like the lepers and a crazy man and others. He taught people the difference between right and wrong." (Boy, 13.)

"He died for His people. He died forgiving the people that killed Him and not cursing them. He cured a blind man. He went and ate at the house of the tax-collector everyone hated, to show people how to treat each other. He told the fishermen to go out and they would catch more fish and they did. Shows they could do things if they had faith in Him." (Boy, 11.)

"He made Saint Magdalene holy. She didn't believe in Jesus. All the children liked Jesus. They stayed near Him. He also helped Saint Joseph make a table. He made wine. When someone got married and they had twelve bad gallons He fixed them. He made fishes and cured many people." (Girl, 14.)

"He healed the sick and He could have had lots of honor and glory, but He did not take it for Himself. He was very generous and forgave people everything." (Girl, 14.)

The question which asked for *a favorite story about Jesus and the reason for its choice* revealed very little. A large number of different stories were mentioned. In some cases, no doubt, they were the only stories remembered or those most recently heard. The birth story was recalled frequently; also the feeding of the five thousand; the Resurrection only once.

Differing interpretations in telling the story of the stilling of the tempest are indicated in these versions offered as favorites by three children:

"I like the one when He calms the sea because His disciples believed in Him and all. When the storm came He was asleep. They woke Him up. He wasn't afraid." (Boy, 14.)

"His fishing. The time Jesus fell asleep and the disciples wakened Him, and He asked why He was awakened at such a time as this. Because He tells them He doesn't take a storm to be much." (Boy, 12.)

"I like the one where they are having all the trouble out on the sea. The people on the boat were afraid and they didn't know what to do. They were afraid that the boat was going to sink. So they looked around for Jesus. He had helped them before. When they found Him they begged Him to calm the waters. He made the waters be still and then they caught a lot of fish and no one was drowned. I like all the stories about the sea and that is the very best one about Jesus." (Girl, 14.)

For most of the children interviewed it was Jesus' effective kindness that made Him great. One of the questions was, *How do you account for the fact that people thought so much of Him; how do you explain His influence?* About half of the replies (30) referred in some general way to His life of helpfulness. "He helped and loved people" and "because He was kind and good" are characteristic replies.

His respect for personality is noted:

"He respected people and cured them." (Boy, 13.)

"He was kind. Children all flocked around Him. He was a man of ability but would never strut but felt Himself on the same level with other men." (Boy, 13.)

"He liked both rich and poor folks and felt He was just one of them." (Boy, 13.)

Several replies stressed our Lord's intellectual power and insight. One child, an Italian girl of eleven, thought His influence could be explained "because He was smart; He knew how to answer questions." "He found things out for Himself"; and "He knew an awful lot"; and "Jesus brought them a new idea," were other answers.

The supernatural character of Jesus, that He was Himself God or a distinctive revelation of God, is explicitly stated in answer to this question in only two instances. Here is a rather long statement from a girl of ten, who had been recently confirmed after extensive preparation:

"The Bible tells us. The Bible is supposed to be true. He is our King. The Bible says, Thou shalt have none other gods before Me—first commandment. He told His disciples to spread His religion and they did and it kept spreading. His life is so beautiful. No man unless he was really God would give up his life for people he loved."

A girl of fifteen who had never attended Sunday school but had been a church member since she was eight, and who took great interest in the interview, said:

"He was superhuman. The people felt it. Some people think He was just an ordinary man with more gifts than others, but I don't agree with them. I think He was superhuman."

A few startling misconceptions were uncovered. A boy of ten replied, "Because He is the father of everyone." Other comments were, "People believed in idols before He came" (girl, 12), and "Before Christ was born people had many gods. But after Jesus was born there is only one God. Jesus made it clear." (Boy, 14.)

That people found in Jesus the Messiah they were expecting is mentioned only once: "Because He was the holy Messiah and He could do miracles. Because of His holy significance." (Boy, 11.) "The Son of God" occurs only in this reply: "Because He lived such a good life, cured so many people, and loved people so much. Because they thought He was the Son of God." (Boy, 11.)

Undoubtedly these boys and girls have heard Jesus referred to as

Saviour. In an effort to discover what associations the word has for them, this question was asked, *When people talk about Jesus as Saviour what do they mean by it?* The wide variety of replies is particularly interesting. The conventional phrases, "He died on the Cross," and "He saved us from our sins" appear only a few times. On the other hand, one is impressed by apparent struggles to explain what His power to save means. In many cases it is thought of as work accomplished in His ministry: "He saved people from dying"; "He saved people from fear and ignorant ways"; "He saved a blind man from blindness." One child said, "He saved people from going to the opposite place from heaven," but there is a conspicuous absence of references to hell or the devil. A somewhat ambiguous answer is, "A person that can save people from Rome."

Several of the answers suggest that salvation involves an ethical change.

"They mean that He saved people from certain deeds they would not like to do. He helped people and made them good and kind again. He died for the good of His people. He was not afraid to die. He must have been great. We should follow Him." (Girl, 12.)

Richard Smith, thirteen, a pupil in a progressive school in New York, and the son of an educational missionary, gave an answer which stands out from all the others. This is what being Saviour meant to him:

"When Jesus came, Rome ruled the world and only the rich and powerful had the right to rule. These few men who ruled caused much starvation and trouble. Jesus wanted to build a new Jewish nation through character and not through military force."

There are a few indications, only a few, that salvation is thought of as still going on in people's lives today. Marshall, a ten-year-old, answered in these words:

"He sort of saves you so you'll have a better life, do the things He wants you to do. By giving you a better life I mean He helps give you a better sense of what to do and what not to do. But you have to want to be saved and do the things the Bible advises."

Several replies show great confusion. One is rather amazing. It comes from Margaret, a thirteen-year-old in the seventh grade, and is quite out of line with her other responses. "That is the way He was kind to God," she said. "He was a Protestant. That's why people call Him Saviour."

There is widespread belief that anti-Semitism with all its horrors is due in part to Christian teaching about the responsibility for Jesus' death. This

belief lends special interest to the answers to the question, *Who crucified Jesus? How can you account for it?*

Seven children could not answer the question; 11 replied "Pontius Pilate," and 9 more included Pontius Pilate in their answer (for instance, "Pilate consented to it, but the Pharisees really did it," and "Pontius Pilate, the higher class"), making 20 in all. Nine replied "the Jews" and 9 included Jews in their answer (for example, "the Jews and the Romans," "some of the Jews"), making 18 in all. Five replied "the Romans" and 7 included Romans in their answers, making 12 in all. Five replied "the people" or "the people who didn't like Him." A girl of eleven said, "The great men of Palestine, something like the rulers and rich men who didn't believe in Him." And another girl of eleven, "Saint Peter. Or was it Saint Judas? No, it wasn't Saint Peter; he was one of the Gospels."

Those who mentioned the Jews made no further comment except in one case when Nancy, fifteen years old, answered, "The Jews. And He was a Jew Himself." When asked further, *Have you ever reasoned out why by dying He did so much good?* she said, "No, I've never understood any more than the Jews did why He was crucified. Except that if God didn't want to save Him He could have saved Himself" (conscious confusion). It is interesting to note how the boys and girls who gave simply "the Jews" as the answer to the first half of the question replied to the second half, *How can you account for it?* Here are their answers:

- "They didn't like Him. They thought He was a terrible man." (Girl, 10.)
- "Because He was so holy." (Boy, 11.)
- "Because they didn't think He was the real Son of God." (Girl, 11.)
- "Because He was so great. The king wanted to be greater." (Girl, 11.)
- "They didn't like what He was telling them." (Girl, 13.)
- "They thought He was bad." Boy, 14.)
- "They didn't like Him. They thought He was a fake." (Girl, 14.)
- "They didn't want Him to be a king. They thought He was acting like a king." (Girl, 15.)

It is evident that these questions did not bring out expressions of animosity against the Jewish race. Such answers as "The Jews crucified Him because they did not believe in God" or "because they are wicked people" are entirely absent.

None of the children accounted for Jesus' crucifixion by relating it to Old Testament prophecy. None of them spoke of His Messianic destiny. There was no attempt at a theological explanation. A reading of all the

answers gives the impression of some slight realization that Jesus' leadership was a threat to entrenched interests—political and religious—but in general there is much vagueness and confusion. More definite teaching is surely needed in regard to the growing antagonism toward Jesus—the relation between His revolutionary ethic and His execution should be emphasized. Apparently most of these boys and girls think of Jesus as a kind healer and teacher who was mysteriously put to death.

Are these children taught that Jesus is still living? In the Church? In the lives of His followers? What, if anything, does the idea of the living Christ mean to them? They were all asked to respond to this question: *Some people think that Jesus is still living. What do you think? What makes you think so?*

The children's evident interest in the question is striking; also the wide variety of opinion reported. In many cases the form that their answers take is unusually interesting and worth considering.

A few of the boys and girls replied definitely that Jesus was not living. "No," replied Anna, a fourteen-year-old girl, a steady attendant in an Episcopal Sunday school, "because He died thousands of years ago. If He is already dead He couldn't be living now."

That Jesus' immortality exists in our thoughts of Him is reflected in three or four of the answers. "He is still living today in our thoughts," said a boy of eleven. And a nine-year-old boy replied, "He couldn't really be living, but people remember Him."

Many of the children have been taught that Jesus is living in heaven. A nine-year-old boy answered with the words of the Creed, "Yes, because He rose on the third day, ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God." Other answers were: "I haven't read any books, but I heard He went up to heaven and never came down." (Girl, 11.) "Living, not on earth, watching us all the time in heaven." (Girl, 10.) "He might be living in heaven. Some say this. I don't know." (Boy, 13.) "He is living up in heaven." And to the question, *What is heaven like?* "A lot of sky and a few clouds." (Girl, 12.)

The Church Year has caused some confusion in the minds of at least two of the respondents. "Jesus is still living," said Marie, a Roman Catholic girl of eleven, who attends a Protestant club. "Every year He arises from the dead. On Palm Sunday, after He had arisen from heaven, the people put palms for Him to walk on." A twelve-year-old Episcopalian, when asked if

Jesus was still living, replied, "Right now? Why, yes, because Lent doesn't start yet, and He is dead during Lent."

Several of the children found difficulty in answering. Here are three thoughtful answers expressing perplexity:

"I think Jesus is not living as a human being but sort of living like a spirit (but I never had a good idea about a spirit). Then I think He is living in some way because we all live in some way after we die." (Boy, 11.)

"People still remember Him and study about Him. I guess He is still living. He is different from George Washington." (Boy, 13.)

"Not really living, but still He is living more than an ordinary person who has died. It is hard to explain the difference. That is the hardest question of all. There is a feeling that can't be described. Knowing that Jesus did live makes God nearer." (Girl, 15.)

That Jesus lives in the Holy Spirit finds expression in some of the answers. A girl of thirteen replied, "His spirit is still living. It is called the Holy Ghost. You can tell by your feeling, the feeling that people have about Him." And a boy of twelve, "Jesus is still living in Holy Spirit because He guides you in all your troubles."

The belief that Jesus lives in the hearts of His followers is reflected in many of the replies. The reasons given suggest various emphases in the teaching received. For example:

"He is still living in some people's heart or spirit. The people believe in God." (Boy, 14.)

"Yes, He is God and is still living in our hearts and spirits and of course He is still living and He is in our hearts and with God, and as we think of God we think of Christ. He is in our hearts day and night." (Girl, 14.)

"Yes, I think He lives in the sense of a spirit but not like I do. And He gives me some power to choose between right and wrong. He sort of works in your conscience. I think so anyway, because that's what I've always heard and read and that is what you say too." (Boy, 13.)

There is no conviction expressed that the spirit of Jesus is found in groups of His disciples or in the historic Church. Apparently His sacramental presence through the Holy Communion has not been taught. The only suggestion of the reality of Christ's presence in worship is in a statement from a thirteen-year-old girl in a Friends' school:

"His body is dead but He left His ideas with people. His work is being carried on through churches and people. When in deep silence, He comes to you. Friends feel that He comes to you through the Inner Light."

As a means of discovering concepts associated with Jesus and feeling tones in regard to Him this question was included in the interview, *What people that you know or have read about make you think of Jesus because they are like Him?* This question yielded very little. On about half the replies it is left out entirely or the answer is "No one." The last phrase, "*because they are like Him*," was often omitted and many answers are therefore ambiguous. There seemed to be a tendency to mention any great leaders who came to mind. A few of the answers, however, give the impression of genuine thought and feeling. Here are some of them:

"Mother and father. Sometimes my mother buys such nice things for me. She is so good." (Girl, 11, Catholic, living on the lower East Side, New York.)

"Bishop Stearly. Mr. McAdam. Mr. McAdam is exactly like him. There's nothing wrong with him at all. He's just holy!" (Nancy, 15, who explained that Mr. McAdam was secretary for the diocese. When asked if he was young or old, she said she had never thought, she guessed he was "middle-aged." He was then thirty-five!)

"Well, I think Dr. Saintsbury (the pastor) and my mother are both a good deal like Him." (Girl, 13.)

"Sometimes I think my house-mother is like Jesus." (Girl, 13, living in a children's home.)

"The Three Musketeers. This might sound dumb. Athos was the best thinker, followed ideas; in this he was a leader. George Fox and William Penn stuck to religion—what they believed was right—and were for peace as Jesus was. David Copperfield in the movie when he was a little boy made me think how Jesus was when He was a little boy." (Girl, 13, whose father was the superintendent of a Friends' First-day school.)

To the question, *Where have you learned about Jesus?* about two thirds replied, "In Sunday school," adding in many instances other sources of instruction—21 mention the church or church services, 20 mention their home or their parents, 15 mention the Bible specifically, 14 mention day schools.

Some of the answers are worth recording:

"In Sunday school and from mother's teaching, as she is always reading the Bible." (Boy, 14.)

"I've been going to Sunday school all my life. In day school we had nothing on the New Testament. I think I learned a lot from listening to good preaching." (Boy, 13.)

"Personally I don't think Sunday school helped me much. Most of what I know I learned in history class." (Girl, 14.)

"I learned about Jesus in Sunday school. In kindergarten we learned about God, but when we got bigger we learned about Jesus." (Girl, 10.)

"In Sunday school we have taken up His life and other subjects. I have learned

the most about Him in my present class. In Junior Department I learned about the Old Testament. In Primary not much about His life, but I did learn about His being in the flowers." (Girl, 12.)

"Sunday school and church and school a little because some things we studied concerned Christ—when the world got started and things like that." (Girl, 12.)

"Sunday school. At grandmother's. An old woman who didn't have much lived with her and she played with me when I was a little girl and visited grandmother. She had a book with Bible verses that she explained to me. We drew pictures. I like to read the Bible." (Girl, 13.)

The children were asked if their father and mother ever talked about Jesus with them. Forty-three answered "Yes," many of them qualifying their answer in some way and 8 mentioning their mother specifically; 14 said "No"; 5 were not living at home or for some other reason failed to answer. A reading of the replies does not give the impression of satisfying and helpful religious instruction in the home except in a few cases like these:

"Sure. Mother tells me lots of stories." (Girl, 11, Catholic.)

"They do. They've helped me through some questions. We do not talk so freely." (Girl, 12.)

"Yes. We gather in a circle around the stove sometimes and talk about everything. First one of us pops up and says something and then another. I like those times we talk about everything—the banks and everything." (Girl, 13, in very poor home on the lower East Side in New York. Mother, Catholic; father, Protestant.)

Nearly all the "Yes" replies were qualified in some such manner as this: "Sometimes"; "Yes, a little"; "Once in a great while"; "Not in common conversation." There was apparent feeling in Nancy's reply, "Mother sometimes. Mother gets started sometimes."

The question, *Do you ever talk about Jesus with your friends?* received in general a negative reply. "No," said one girl, "it never rises up at all." Twenty-four of the boys and girls replied, however, that they did talk about Him sometimes, most of them connecting their conversations with Sunday school or Bible class. Some of their answers are particularly interesting.

"Only in Sunday school when we are all talking about Him. I'd rather not talk about Him. For example, there are several things I don't believe and I don't want to talk about Him. . . . It is much easier to talk to a group than with individuals. The people who do talk about Him are the ones who are supposed to. Also, it is much more difficult to talk with people your own age; they are almost sure to laugh at you." (Girl, 13.)

"One girl. We sometimes tell each other stories of parts of His life. She is Roman Catholic. I love to talk about it. I don't know why. It is so interesting." (Girl, 10, Episcopalian.)

"I discuss religion with my friends. We talk about whether one Church is higher than the other. We have hot arguments. We never mention Jesus." (Girl, 14.)

"Yes, when I get to know them well. We had a teacher last year who was an atheist, and we had great discussions trying to answer his questions." (Girl, 14.)

"No. We talk about other things that the crowd is more interested in. Once in a while in Sunday school I ask another fellow something and we try to get the teacher to answer." (Boy, 11.)

These interviews might be much improved—other questions inserted, some of these left out. A question about the relation of Jesus to God is needed; also something that might bring out ideas about Jesus' connection with the historic Church. A question on books about Jesus would be useful. Every child should be asked what questions he would like to propound for the leader to answer.

That guided interviews on Jesus such as have been reported have value for the teacher or leader is abundantly shown by the reports given. That they are helpful for the boys and girls who are interviewed is suggested by some of the remarks volunteered by the children. When Sally, a thirteen-year-old girl, left, she said, "Thank you for asking me these questions. I liked them because now I feel I know more about it." And another child, also thirteen, expressed what seems to have been a rather general feeling when she said, "It makes me feel good to talk about things like this."

SCHEDULE FOR INTERVIEW

Setting described. Background facts. Age and grade of child. Denomination.

Experience in church school, etcetera.

1. How long ago did Jesus live?
2. In what country did He live?
3. Where was He born?
4. What were the most important things He did in His life?
5. How do you account for the fact that people think so much of Him? How do you explain His influence?
6. When people speak of Jesus as Saviour what do they mean by it?
7. Who crucified Jesus? How can you account for it?
8. Some people think that Jesus is still living. What do you think? What makes you think so?
9. Of all the stories that you have heard about Jesus which do you like best? Why?
10. Where have you learned about Jesus?
11. Do you ever talk about Him with your friends?
12. Do your father and mother ever talk about Him?
13. What people that you know or that you have read about make you think of Jesus because they are like Him?

Christianity as Idea and as Event

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

I

ONE of the most striking developments in theological thought which has come in the last generation is that which concerns the relationship of the Christian religion to the process of history. During the first part of the present century the dominant conception among thoughtful Christians was one which was related to history only incidentally. Just as modern chemistry can be treated as a finished system, the truth of which is independent of the dark and checkered history of this science, so a spiritual religion, it was believed, might also be considered. One of the most interesting expressions of this mood is to be found in the words of Lord Gifford upon the institution of what may be truly called the most distinguished lectureship in the world.

Lord Gifford hoped that his lecturers would treat the subject of natural theology "without reference to or reliance on any supposed special, exceptional, or so-called miraculous revelation." Natural theology could be considered, Lord Gifford supposed, as a science consisting of truths reached altogether independently of an historical religion. Accordingly, the lecturers were supposed to treat their subject just as they would treat of "astronomy or chemistry," but it is well known that they have had great difficulty in doing this.

Though the foundation established in the Gifford Lectures concerned natural theology as a whole and not *Christian* theology, there was a strong tendency to regard Christian theology in the same light. Christianity was, it seemed, only a name for a purified high religion of the spirit, shared by peoples of many times and places, and not necessarily tied to events which took place in Palestine. Indeed, it might as well be built upon Chinese or Indian culture rather than the Hebraic and Hellenic. In other words, it was essentially idea. By saying it was idea we do not mean to suggest that the conception was wholly intellectual, shutting out the appeal to religious experience. *We mean, rather, that both the intellectual formulation and the experience were conceived as independent of temporal considerations.* On this basis, we might neglect the slow or rapid stages by which the gospel came, we might eliminate from our survey all events between the departure of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees and the arrival of delegates at Madras. Christianity

would then be a high, catholic, nonlocal religion, which could be entered into on its own merits and without any attention to its development. The series of events would be incidental. If the purpose of our journey is to reach the mountaintop, so the argument runs, why should we concern ourselves greatly with the tortuous path by which we reach it?

The dominance of this conception is striking evidence of the influence of ideas derived from natural science. The conception of the Christian faith just suggested is strictly parallel to the dominant conception of physics or chemistry. And it is the recognition of this fact which helps us to free our minds of the conception. The change in emphasis has come about partly through a recognition that theology, however scientific it may become, is, in fact, strikingly different from the natural sciences. It differs from them, not because it depends upon authority, whereas they depend upon facts, for authority plays an enormous part in natural science and fact plays an enormous part in religion; but because of a characteristic shared by theology with other humanistic disciplines, the characteristic of dependence upon historical processes. Perhaps no theologian has expressed this as clearly as has William Temple.

It is no accident that in our colleges we give much attention to the History of Philosophy, the History of Religion, the History of Art, but little attention to the History of Science. This is not because the history of science is not interesting, but because it is not *essential*, whereas, in the consideration of all phases of spiritual life, it is strictly essential. Science can be handled in temporal cross sections. The freshman can begin his course in natural science without any historical preparation and even such historical references as occur are largely incidental. Boyle's law could be given a number as well as a name, and it is hardly important to know that Boyle lived in the seventeenth century. The only significant question is the present truth and usefulness of the law.

I am glad to record my gratitude to my beloved teacher, Professor Lovejoy, for his insistence that philosophy cannot be divorced from the history of philosophy. He is fond of saying that you cannot philosophize *in vacuo*. The history of reflective thought, as he shows in his introduction to his Carus Lectures, is really a great and sustained conversation, but a conversation in which we help one another to arrive at some specific conclusions.

Our efforts to present either philosophy or religion in the cross-section, scientific manner are never completely successful. We give courses called "Introduction to Philosophy," arranged by problems rather than by chron-

ology, but we find ourselves showing how Plato or Descartes dealt with each problem. This is even more true in religion, where we cannot avoid the relapse into narrative. Donald Hankey's *The Lord of All Good Life* is far more convincing, even to critical students, than is a treatise on the divinity of Christ. Sooner or later we must illustrate the point in question by telling how God dealt with men in former times. The gospel song, "Tell Me the Old, Old Story," points to what is really inescapable. Religion as mere speculation is poor and thin, because it is abstract.

Science has a history, in the sense that there is a crude scaffolding by which the scientific enterprise has arrived at its present eminence, but the point is that, having arrived, it can neglect the scaffolding or even kick it away, but, in the life of the spirit, the scaffolding is an integral part of the structure.

This significant difference between natural science on the one hand, and religion or any other humanistic discipline on the other, arises from the fact that natural science is abstract whereas the spiritual life is always concrete. The reason why the scientist can afford to neglect the historical context of a discovery is that he has drawn out all aspects of reality except one. His fundamental task is to find laws and relations which are universally valid because they are considered in isolation. Even individuals are nothing but examples. Religion, on the other hand, cannot be abstract, it cannot isolate, it must see men in the full concreteness of their stations. A religious truth, then, is not something that can be symbolized by equations on a blackboard, the most bloodless things conceivable, but is something that can only be demonstrated in the process of living in society and in history. The Christian faith, in its emphasis on the Incarnation, has always held this conviction implicitly, but the contrast with natural science, available in our day, helps this conviction to become fully explicit.

The effort to consider theology after the fashion of natural science as expressed by Lord Gifford's will, represents the triumph of the Hegelian conception of Christianity. In the Hegelian system, Christianity is presented as true, in that it is the logical outcome of *any* truly reflective thought. *Any* reflective person, alert to the facts of the world, would arrive eventually at the notion of God, of the Trinity, and of human sonship. Its truth is inherent and was sure to be reached sooner or later. Those who have shared in its history have been tools of the dialectical process. But if we take Hegel seriously we see that the notion of Christianity as dateless truth is itself a thesis in unstable equilibrium and we expect an antithesis.

The Gifford Lectures have demonstrated in a most interesting manner some of this dialectic. Lord Gifford's thesis, honestly considered and examined at its basis, has demonstrated its own insufficiency and has led us over to its antithesis. Lord Gifford, looking down from heaven, must have been surprised to find Karl Barth lecturing in Scotland. We are now in this second dialectical moment, perhaps ushered in by Professor Webb's Lectures of 1918, in which there are voices on every hand declaring that Christianity is more an event than an idea. It is, they say, something which happened in Palestine.

We cannot reasonably expect to remain in this second phase of the dialectic movement, since it is essentially a negative one, a wholesome corrective. What is to be the synthesis? My purpose is to suggest certain pertinent considerations which seem to bear on the question, and, in recognition of which it is easier to see what the third phase of the dialectical movement may be. Undoubtedly we shall agree in the end that Christianity is both idea and history, but *the important question is the precise manner in which the factors are combined*. My task is to point out some of the problems, leaving the conclusion both brief and tentative.

II

The first consideration to note is that there is no possible return to the thesis. In this, as in so many other areas of reflection, we can accept something of Hegel's method while rejecting his major conclusions. We must reject the notion of Christianity as *mere idea*, not only because this represents an uncritical approximation of the mood of natural science, but also because this interpretation does not do justice to the actual data of Christianity. Certainly it is clear that the chief elements of Christianity arose in critical times, having a peculiar character.

It is interesting to imagine what a purely speculative religion would be like. Some creative mind might draw up a plan of a good religion, as other minds have drawn up plans of an ideal commonwealth. This could be studied as a finished product and accepted. This religion would contain the notion that God is objectively real, that He is spiritual in nature, and that He loves men as a good father loves his sons and daughters. Moreover, He continually reaches out to men by means of His eternal Word and has made all hearts restless until they rest in Him. This religion might be accurately termed a gospel, since it would be good news about God and man. It would involve the idea that men could have a partial, but nevertheless genuine and trustworthy

knowledge of the Living God, irrespective of their race or tradition, for God has not left any person without an inner witness. It would follow that we should hail men as brothers all over the world, since all are children of a common Father. We should fight for the elimination of war and of poverty because these tend to disfigure and obscure "that of God in every man." A whole social gospel can be built on the notion of a divine seed in all men.

A religion so understood would be as independent of geography as history. It would make no difference to such a religion if the Eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea were a bit larger and the buffer state between competing lands and ideologies, the land of Palestine, had never been a land at all. Such a religion would not need any reference to a chosen people, to the patriarchs, or to the prophets of Israel. It would be a religion of universal scope and universal appeal.

If some gifted thinker had developed such a religion, and written a book about it, it would have been a good religion. Powerful arguments could be used to support its chief contentions, especially those familiar to students of natural theology, and the central experience of the enduring love of God could be verified in the experience of countless individual Christians. Such a religion might be true in its chief tenets, even if the stories about the origin of Christianity were all false.

Now we may be practically certain that nothing of the kind ever took place. This is not the way religion in general arises, and assuredly it is not the way Christianity arose. Just because religious insight comes to minds in great bursts, it does not follow that a religion can be made out of whole cloth. The prophets of Israel were part of a tradition, and a good tradition, even when they revolted against certain aspects of it. Christ's teaching came as an antidote to the decayed prophetic movement just as that movement had come as an antidote to a decayed emphasis on worship. But there is no suggestion of any important insight appearing in a man who sits down and says to himself, I will now construct a religion out of whole cloth. The few efforts of this kind which we know are feeble indeed. Great religious insight comes not in a cool hour, but in fierce objection to abuses. It comes not with equilibrium; but with counter-thrust.

It has occurred to several persons to suppose that Jesus never existed, that Christianity is an artificial synthesis, but the facts are very hard to explain on this basis. The mind that could create the story would be as miraculous as the Incarnation itself, and the amazing burst of new life involved in the spread

of Christianity would be unexplained. H. G. Wood is speaking for many sober historical scholars when he says:

"Those who have not entered far into the laborious inquiry may pretend that the historicity of Jesus is an open question. For me to adopt such a pretense would be sheer intellectual dishonesty. I know I must, as an honest man, reckon with Jesus as a factor in history. I cannot rightly ignore or evade the challenge of His story."¹

In Christianity we are not concerned so much with what might have been, but with what *was*. It is not a dream, but is rooted in the actual. Christianity arose in a stream of experience of a race of men who had been the recipients of a peculiar and precious revelation. The beginnings of the religion of Israel we now recognize as similar to the early religions of many other peoples, but they later came to see, in remarkable stages, the notion that God is spiritual, that He is universal, and that His requirements are ethical in nature. The greatest step came in the rise of the prophetic movement.

Christianity belonged to this movement in a particular time and place, and is hardly conceivable in any other. The Incarnation occurred in this particular setting at the fullness of time. In view of the untenability of the Christ-myth theory, and in view of the closeness of Christ to a particular background, we are safe in saying that Christianity is not, never has been, and can never be, *mere* idea.

How truly it involved the element of narrative in New Testament time is demonstrated by a consideration of the method of evangelism shown in the book of Acts. Once, at least, in the course of his visit to Athens, Saint Paul sought to deal with the gospel as idea, but his more common method seems to have been that demonstrated at Antioch, in which he told the familiar story of God's dealings with His people—the life in Egypt, the Exodus, the new land, the Captivity, the Baptist, Jesus Christ. The story alone seems to have been the chief persuasion and the most effective of the two methods. This method of apologetic really belongs to the whole Judeo-Christian tradition, and is still illustrated by Jewish thinkers such as Rabbi Silver. The Old Testament includes many books of "Acts."

III

In the second place, we cannot be satisfied with the antithesis, the interpretation of Christianity as mere event. Here three particular problems arise,

¹ H. G. Wood, *Christianity and the Nature of History*, p. xxxiii.

the problem of *meaning*, the problem of *independence*, and the problem of *divine fairness*.

a. *The problem of meaning* is apparent when we realize that a mere event is really very close to nothing at all. It is reported to us, on excellent authority, that Doctor Johnson wrote a letter to Mrs. Thrale on May 1, 1780, while that good lady and her husband were at Bath, but it is a fact that makes very little difference. In and of itself it is nothing. An event in history is not important unless it connects significantly with other events and, somehow, *matches* them. But this is only possible if there is a level of idea to which the historical event points. This is another way of saying that religion must be concerned with truth as well as facts and events.

The mere fact that Christ was born in Bethlehem is, as mere fact, of little value. Even the fact that Christ taught, or that Christ died, has no religious value until interpreted. The essence of Christianity does not consist in the fact that a person in Palestine worked wonders or even that this person rose from the dead; there have been many wonder workers. The power of the Christian faith begins to appear only when these events are matched by a sympathetic response on the part of men who may live at any time or place. It was Christ who said that the true shrine was limited neither to this mountain nor to Jerusalem, but was "in spirit and in truth." Just as the idea gains power when it is "rooted in the actual," so an historical event takes on meaning only when it becomes the vehicle of a nontemporal idea. The historical events of Christianity are important because of what they mean. It is not history, as such, that is important, but a particular history, and when we select one history we are passing out of the category of mere event.

b. *The problem of independence* arises as soon as we consider an obvious question. To what extent can men enter into Christian experience without any conscious connection with the known events of Christian history?

The truth seems to be that men have reached the same conclusions independently. On the highest levels of religious experience, men speak to each other across the chasms of time or of tradition and understand each other. The fundamental agreement in the reports of religious experience, not only within the Christian faith, over many centuries, but between the great religions, has been noted by many careful scholars. This fundamental agreement is one of the chief means by which the believer is able to make an effective answer to the suggestion that all knowledge of God is illusory. If there is substantial agreement in spite of differences in background, it is difficult for

the skeptic to discount the reports, for they are strictly parallel to reports about the physical order.

The fundamental agreement has been expressed by familiar words of Doctor Inge:

"On all questions about religion there is the most distressing divergency. But the saints do not contradict one another. They all tell the same story. They claim to have had glimpses of the land that is very far off, and they prove that they have been there by bringing back perfectly consistent and harmonious reports of it."

In one of his inimitable devotional writings, Dr. Rendel Harris quotes a Moslem prayer, points out its similarity to "Lead, Kindly Light," and says, "I can imagine that it could be used, with very slight reserve, in Saint Paul's Cathedral." How religious experiences we call Christian may be matched by experiences of a similar nature in other religions can be shown convincingly by the translations of Indian lyrics which Gandhi made in prison.²

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that many of the features of what we call the Christian religion are found outside that religion. It has long been noted that these were found among individuals who lived before the Incarnation, and numerous thinkers have referred to Socrates as a Christian before Christ. We know now that some of what we call Christian virtues are found among people who do not call themselves Christians at all. Without the mediation of Christ they seem, sometimes, to arrive at a sense of the love of God similar to that arrived at by those who have the advantage of Christ's mediation. This is true of the purer spirits in each group for, however paths may be separated on the lower levels of experience, they approach one another at the top. The best evidence of this is found in the literature of mysticism. It is difficult to reject the deep truth involved in the words of William Penn when he wrote,

"The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion, and when death has taken off the mask, they will know one another, though the diverse liveries they wear here make them strangers."

It is a deep appreciation of this consideration which, more than anything else, makes it unlikely that the second or negative phase of the dialectical movement is the final one. How can these facts be explained if the first phase of our dialectic is entirely false?

c. *The problem of divine fairness* is a pertinent consideration. It might

² *Songs from Prison*, 1934. The verse form is provided by John S. Hoyland.

also be called "the problem of partiality," a problem generally parallel to the problem of evil. The essence of the problem of evil consists in our moral revulsion at a situation in which the innocent suffer, and the parallel problem consists in our sense of unfairness in making the gospel available to only a few. If Christianity is chiefly a set of events, rather than generalized and catholic idea, certain groups of humans have had an enormous advantage over others. Why should the Jews be chosen? Why should the Eastern Mediterranean be so favored? Why should the means of eternal hope and universal salvation be localized? Here the moral character of God is at stake.

The point of this problem becomes still more sharp when we consider the hypothesis of the existence of other sentient and supposedly salvable creatures on other planets or even outside our solar system. If Christianity is solely or chiefly a matter of history, and a history confined to the earth, it is hard to see how other "men" in other sidereal locations are to take advantage of that which is so important for the salvation of their souls. Of course there may not be such creatures, but their existence is a live possibility.

Early in the nineteenth century the influential Scottish divine, Thomas Chalmers, gave a series of addresses on the bearing of "Modern Astronomy" on the Christian Revelation. He freely admitted the possibility of other inhabited worlds and asked how we could know that the Christian dispensation was limited to our planet.

"How do you infidels know that Christianity is set up for the single benefit of this earth and its inhabitants? How are they able to tell us, that if you go to other planets, the person and religion of Jesus are there unknown to them?"

In spite of Chalmers' easy sentence, it is hard to see that this is an adequate answer. Can men be helped by what is mere historical event, if they have no knowledge of the event? Unless there is something like the Logos doctrine central to Christianity, the problem of unfairness continues in a glaring fashion.

Perhaps this problem of unfairness must remain a problem with no adequate answer. We can suggest, however, that some unfairness is a necessary price for any real revelation at all. An unhistorical revelation would not be revelation, and if it is historical there must be favored people. In a similar fashion, we believe that if there is to be genuine goodness, there must be the possibility of sin and thus the problem of evil is part of the price we pay for real moral experience.

But it remains true that the very existence of this problem renders the second phase of our dialectical movement unsatisfactory.

IV

We can expect a synthesis to restate the thesis with less naïvete, and with the addition of insights provided by the antithesis. In the end we must see Christianity as high, universal, and, in conception, truly catholic, yet it is never an abstract universal. The love of God is shown in history; it cannot be shown in a textbook, a theorem or an equation. Therefore the story of God's dealing with men and God's revelation to men is paramount, but it is a story that is infinitely repeatable, on a smaller scale. The men of Mars, if there are any, may know that God is always reaching out to men, even by the method of incarnation. Because of what happened in Palestine we have a suggestion of the kind of event that ought to happen, in measure, wherever there are men.

In conclusion, we see that the contrast between natural science and theology, with which we began, leads to the recognition of a profound paradox. Science has no real classics, in the sense of what is universal in appeal, irrespective of time. There are interesting older books of science, but they are superseded. Religion, however, abounds with classics which are wonderfully dateless. Thus science in its abstraction is limited by the time process, but religion, which boldly admits its concern with temporal events, achieves a real universality and practical independence of time, since the saints do not contradict each other.

Christianity is ultimately a universal idea because it was first a series of events in history. It is idea because it is objectively true, and thus superior to process, but it is history because it is through the process of events that the truth becomes known. The only way in which an idea can manifest itself as a truly *religious* idea is to manifest itself in historical events. The reason why Christianity is historical is that it is true.

A Churchmanship for Our Times

EDWARD W. BLAKEMAN

HOW may ethical values of Christianity be attained or by what means may the trained leadership of the Church influence communities is a question which constitutes a specific challenge in our decade. For example:

1. At a time when *liberty*, as viewed by students of the New Testament, is about to be superseded because we lack *security*, what shall be the pastor's approach to labor? the pastor's part in employment of youth? the pastor's contribution to labor reform?
2. If the pastor fails to function effectively as Marital Relations *Counselor*, what will happen to the Church in relation to the Home and to sex morals in our community life during the next few decades?
3. How shall the pastor function as a religious educator parallel to the public schools?
4. Can the modern pastor, set in a city situation, where the *environment* shapes attitudes of children and youth, ignore educational psychology, evade a critical analysis of group motivation and slight or defy sociological findings, and yet be a *directing influence* in the lives of his members and families?
5. Can our broken Christian line be patched so that Christian grace can be mediated, a religious interpretation offered and the *whole community* mellowed as well as strengthened in social behavior? Is it the office of pastors to become a staff of leaders demonstrating Christian co-operation?

I. *The Pastor in Industrial Life*

The Industrial Revolution ushered in our present stage of world commerce. Its general goal—to banish poverty—has largely been accomplished. We can now produce enough to supply the American population and provide for every family a good standard of living. The problem now is to extricate the *person* from the social devices and the machineries which were evolved for that purpose. How can we restore the person to centrality? But, we are asked, what has a pastor or the pastoral office to do with such a cultural issue?

As religious leaders we do not reply in the terms of change in economic structure, though it would seem probable that America will move speedily in the direction of a more general socialization. Our reply, however, will be along the lines of purpose. Religion has to do with three great major issues: (1) Personal enrichment through faith and love, (2) voluntary entry into a life of sacrificial and vicarious participation with the Prophets and Christ, and (3) the fellowship with God which is exemplified by Jesus and the saints, that is, the Church. Few of us believe that these purposes by preaching alone will lay hold of the minds and come to be determinative in the habit patterns of children and youth or of men and women in adult life. We agree that our religion must be worked out in effort, must proceed from faith to the ethic, must be embraced first by commitment in the affections, and, finally, practiced throughout the muscular behavior of the person and the responses of the group. Christianization now, as always, depends upon the ethical result attained. Patient leadership alone can accomplish the task. Today that leadership begins not with willing hands and clear heads, but with disappointed hearts and confused minds.

Our youth, in common with youth of every generation, see employment, an occupation, a place to make a significant contribution as a value which is their right. Here is where the natural man either serves a spiritual purpose or turns upon itself and society as a destructive suicidal force. The maturing adolescent self, driven from behind by urges instinctive and powerful, is pushed forward into performance. If each youth by society can be made to feel and know that the work at hand is particularly his own, that the skill he is learning is a handiwork akin to the work of the Creator and may be dedicated reverently to the God from whom the whole human family has come, then that youth and his generation may become religious. On the other hand, when denied this connection and its interpretation, denied these freedoms, diverted from creativity by social circumstance, youth fall short of faith, stop at a physical level, move into manhood and womanhood starved of soul, stunted just where they should have heightened into giants of body and spirit. Furthermore, they stand there as a warning to us. A generation so stunted—beholding those possible satisfactions in vain—a generation with a soul hunger unsatisfied, reared in sight of these withheld values which they see as their right, is not apt to be teachable, docile, good followers, readily pressed into factories, quickly rallied to the flag, or even easily called to our schoolrooms or successfully placed in father's business or enveloped by mother's social

group. What is the relation of the pastoral office to a problem like this?

The pastoral function is much more directly related to this issue of creativity, honest work and a place to make a contribution than the pulpit can possibly be. There are two reasons for such a statement. (1) It is the pastor, not the preacher, who is a community agent. Due to the long history of religion, which is the mother of the arts, the pastor can ring any doorbell at any time and be in good professional form. The social worker, whose occupation is a daughter of the pastoral function, must wait until the family is on her record or certified by some authority. The physician cannot call upon his neighbor whom he knows to be ill unless the neighbor asks him for service. The schoolteacher is limited to the families whose children are in her grade or school. The scoutmaster deals only with youth of an age group and a given enrollment. The attorney, whose familiarity with the law leads him to know what would unlock a situation and bring municipal aid, cannot break into a family circle and volunteer advice. Even the city officer, policeman, sanitation inspector, or rural supervisor moves on the fundamental assumption in our democracy, that each face-to-face family unit is a law unto itself and is aided by the government only upon request, or signal of distress. But the pastor, historically, humanly, culturally, is welcome in any home at any time. And regardless of all the blunders we of "the cloth" have made, the pastor can go, uninvited, when and where no other leader can go. Likewise, where the pastor is thoroughly dedicated to God and knows the aim of the Christian life, he, after a brief span of time and a few conversations, can go straight to the central problem of personal or group living. To insist upon the dignity of labor and the restoration of the opportunity to work is a pastor's proper field of leadership.

(2) Not only have we as pastors a unique approach to the workers as well as to others, but as pastors we have a unique charter as to the straightening of various tangles in the skein of American industrial life. (a) The *racial tensions* show up in labor. One needs to know only a little of laboring groups to understand that the Negro people need the aid of a pastor who considers a man a man "for a' that." Religion can and should have a clear voice in behalf of the person regardless of his skin or his origin. Sermons seldom reach the situations which are real. To leave these offices to those of one race is wrong. It is a Christian, not a Negro problem.

(b) There are national or *cultural tensions* among the laborers, just as there are problems throughout our population. The pastor moving from

home to home, the diagnostician meeting men and women informally in the interest of faith is essential to Christian social development. The pastor, near to the people and possessing data to bring mercy to temper justice or using knowledge to correct error in city life or business, is as much needed in America today as that courageous work was needed in the eighteenth-century days of the Wesleys in England and Wales. There are layers of population in every modern industrial area. Each group was brought in to break a strike. As soon as a layer becomes union-conscious and the families begin to lift themselves to a better standard of living and to take on solidarity with other workers, a new layer is brought. Today one layer after another has been dumped like worn-out machines. They have been thrown upon the Welfare for support. The "sit-down" and the "slow-down" are the most recent methods of recoil from the injustice and insecurity of periodical labor and lay-off. The pastors of America should be the men who have "case" records, know the inner longings of families, understand the souls of these people and have access to them. On the contrary, pastors who can transcend cultural differences are scarce. Few men in the ministry who have been well trained and carry prestige have exemplified Christ in industrial America, where the thousands suffer and their suffering breeds revolution.

(c) *Personnel departments* exist in large industrial plants. These are the departments which tend to become buffers between the man and his citizenship, a hidden control upon human freedom. Where pastors are vigilant, know these personnel managers, keep close to the homes of the workers, voluntarily stand for the rights of the workmen, their wives and their children, and can steadily interpret to corporation leaders the Christian view of labor and to labor, a Christian view of production, much is being accomplished. The entry into this field is through a study of aptitude testing. But here one pastor in a group should function for the whole group. Let that specializing pastor familiarize himself with the literature of vocational guidance and education, join with the leaders in that specialty, attain guidance techniques, gain the confidence of his neighborhood by advising the youth, or master the security program of his state and confer intelligently with men who seek employment, and his associates will find their souls enriched. Likewise, those churches will be loved. Better still, such a minister can teach his community the religious meaning of honest work, and may be able to set in process frank and wholesome devotion to those major local and remote industries which feed, clothe, and physically sustain our civilization.

For fifty years the leadership of Christianity has adopted a sociological and creative theory of religious practice. The argument ran that it was the duty of creative persons in the Church, sensitized by their religious motives, to discover a social need, to devote time and thought to an exploration of the opportunities in that particular field, and then, when the art of meeting that need had become systematized and a discipline for its continuance had been developed, these religious persons would set off that newly created discipline in the community upon a wider social basis than the Church. This was thought of as creative Christian leadership. This is illustrated by what happened in relation to the care of the aged. It was the Church that created homes for the aged and then set them on a community base. The same thing happened in relation to education, first higher education and then public education. In the main, it was the Church which created the Christian college, reduced the learning of the times to teachable literature, created teaching technique, and then set off these disciplines, Harvard being the first, to a broader social basis. The same thing happened in relation to hospitals. At a later period the charity which grew up within the Church was set off to operate within the community, so that our welfare workers today are in fact children of the Church. However, we now find that our civilization has grown so fast, resources of our nation have been so great, mechanical skill of our engineers has been so expert, and the tendency to organize ourselves into urban life has so completely removed us from the softening influence of nature that these institutions thought of as civilization itself seem to be remote from the devotional life of the Church, apart from the significant teachings of the New Testament, and at times proceeding upon an ethic which by no stretch of the imagination could be identified with the mind of Jesus. Therefore, it may be proper for the Church in the present decade to turn again to the civilization which it has created, scrutinize these disciplines anew, and call upon pastors to specialize in given fields for the purpose of reinterpreting civilization to itself, or at least to those who now lead in it.

II. *Marital Relations Is Our Domain*

Skepticism among the university students whom we interview today is not due chiefly to science-religion conflict, nor to the supposed ecclesiastical lag nor to apparent futility of all culture in decades of rapid change, but is caused by the *social contradictions* of our age. Mating is native and sacred. Our youth accept marriage as in some degree sacred, made in heaven as it

were, and constituting a right or a value held out to them by God or by the race or by this life we are in. Yet here is a social system, an American code of morals, which halts marriage until security has been attained. That same American code withholds freedom to work or retards the date when security can be assured to the young man. Also, that same American custom asks the youth, the young couple, the groping and inexperienced person to seek advice as to the mystery of birth, the nature of romantic love, differentiation between love and lust, not from pastors but from laymen. Advice as to the rich rewards of conjugal temperance or the dangers of intemperance is sought today not from pastors, but from physicians who operate in part for pay, or from clinics, which in method and spirit are remote from religion. At its worst, advice in this zone of home relations is obtained from agencies with quack expedients or devices to sell, or from self-elected specialists who by no stretch of the imagination can bring to romance or to mating and marriage that sense of the sacred which a Christian interpretation of life enjoins.

Here is a central obligation of pastors. Every pastor should have an introductory knowledge of biology and the reproductive process before he is appointed to a parish. It is evident, however, that it would take a long time to reach such a degree of preparedness. We would therefore advocate that some one person prepare, and he for the entire group of pastors become the mentor in this particular field. Such a man will need to take a period of clinical work in some parish with a seasoned master of the pastoral art before he is set in the midst of youth and young parents or made the chairman of this responsible committee among pastors. This is advocated not to encourage infringement upon the physician's domain, nor to question the honor of the noble practitioners who guard health, fight disease, protect the young, and extend human life, but to assure to society a trenchant religious theory of life.

We have come into a new freedom. Youth speak freely to each other about matters held to be private by former generations. The "Delinquency News Letter" of December states that there are no less than 421 periodicals in America which are being promoted largely upon sex interest. We know that druggists freely market for profit the data which physicians only can handle with wisdom. Throughout the nation is a far-reaching campaign against social diseases, and there is a new and disconcerting general acquaintance with the whole subject. Parents who appear at the welfare desks are given courses of instruction designed to halt the growth of families in homes on the border of poverty. These facts thrust before our people a wilderness

of biological issues which in turn impinge upon persons before any adequate interpretation of life can be disseminated. About these issues pastors relatively ignorant ten years ago must now have a counselor's general knowledge. For the man who will take the time to acquaint himself with the elementary lessons in mating there is open a door of great usefulness.

It is fair to predict that men who can bring to the communities some clinical training will do much to exalt the home, revitalize all health authorities, make a significant contribution in public morals, and guarantee to the Church a new grip on those realistic members who determine the course of our cities and institutions. It is possible that by a frank relation to these problems on the part of any one pastor, all the pastors of a community may be able to capture the imagination of that ever-increasing throng of youth who pass the church with a shrug. These sons and daughters of ours, tempted as they are to repudiate the wisdom of the ages while they experiment all over again in a danger zone, merit the leadership of men dedicated to God. I state this, knowing that every week the youth of a little city like Ann Arbor, according to a survey, patronize over one hundred different places of amusement, many of which seem to have set the stage for levity as well as entertainment or play.

The pastor should not need to leave his pulpit, nor seriously change his relation to the other functions of his church and his flock to accomplish what is here being advocated. Of course, it will seriously cut in on his time according to an old schedule. Our plea is for one man in each group of pastors to specialize in social and marital relations for the whole community. Critics will say, let the social worker, the play leader and the physician so function. To be certain, these agents will function. But where is the physician, or the social worker, or the play leader who will interpret his function to include the religious phases of such a problem? The pastoral group, with one of their members as a leader, could call to their aid given men in the medical profession, certain social workers and the health authorities.

This larger group, in turn, with one alert, trained pastor representing all the men in the ministry, would be met by a new community psychology as soon as they sat down to digest the vast literature and master the scientific findings and come to learn how to use the sociological techniques of our time. The community leaders, along with this pastor member, would begin to have a new grasp on the meaning of religion and the better self within each one would be released to function on a wider scale and for a deeper purpose than ever before. More important, this reverent approach to the problem would

be met by a willingness to participate. Youth would respond on a high level of honor, and within a generation a city so served would be on its way to a finer culture and a nobler enjoyment of the spirit.

This service cannot be performed by separate denominational staffs. A community basis would be imperative. Helps are at hand for the man who will explore this zone: (1) Mental hygiene, psychological and sociological approaches to child training include data on group needs, motivation, native desires, love and mating; (2) clinics, conferences, and courses are offered upon youth problems; (3) literature upon human relations, courtship and human destiny is available. Not until these are accepted as sacred and given the symbolic, as well as the technical attention of the clergy, will the influence of religion have a chance to play upon these phases of our civilization. A ministry in this area should unlock such issues as divorce, sex motives in literature or the movies, child delinquency and the tendency toward juvenile crime. But, more important, the Church by this process may again be harnessed to its social and cultural load.

III. *The Pastor and the Public School*

Twenty years ago many of us were challenged by the idea of released time for religious instruction. Today that approach to religious education seems relatively barren. (1) Because we now know that children do not learn from courses, but through directed activity. In this field character education has surpassed the church effort. (2) The released time idea seems relatively barren because denominational units have lived beyond their day of usefulness and now obstruct community religious education for the young. (3) Because the churches, having failed for one hundred and fifty years to make use of the Saturday-Sunday segment of each week which was courteously left to them for moral and religious instruction, must come apologetically when they now ask for further gratuities from the schools. Rather, every pastor should be both a guide in practical religion and a teacher of teachers. The relation which offers returns in the immediate future for the pastor or the group of pastors is that of a close and intimate adviser to the parents.

We are in an epoch when conduct rather than meditation has general attention. The unmistakable trend of creative thought about religion during the past three decades has been in the general direction of a voluntary religious behavior. The significant contributions which have been made to an understanding of religion since the beginning of the present century have

been in applied religion. Professor William C. Bower holds that this trend of thought had its rise in Harold Hoffding's idea that religion is concerned fundamentally with the conservation of values. End-seeking behavior has become the essential element in our Christianity. It has its roots in the will to live. The Founder of Christianity gave us the phrase, "to have life and to have it more abundantly." Only homes wisely guided by pastors can quickly commute to the next generation such an emphasis. Homes are near to the basic wishes of children, while schools and churches are remote. The pastor by skill can train parents as can no other leader.

Professor A. A. Robach, who has written with insight upon "The Psychology of Character," says: "Why the more integrated man possesses a better character than the less integrated individual can be understood only in terms of fundamental principles, ideals, strivings, purposes." What are some of those strivings? Basic desires are the key. If the pastor-coach needs a teaching plan, sociology offers one. The most usable plan is the well-known set of basic wishes by Professor W. I. Thomas. The growing child or youth wishes: (1) *For new experiences*, that is, the child is in need of variety. Change is a constant necessity. (2) *For security*; order, regularity, evenness, an on-moving program, a sure home life are needed. (3) *For recognition and approval*. The child wishes status, to be accepted; and (4) *For dominance*. First he must have control, in a small scale, to walk. Then he has control of toys. Later he learns to ride a tricycle, etcetera, then other dominance.

To that list of *desires or wishes*, Professor Emory Bogardus wisely added a fifth set of desires, namely: (5) *Desire for otherness or love*—that is, the child longs for a task, is gregarious, runs to another child, wants to participate. So, also, youth needs a cause. In this series of five fundamental desires, the religious home has a usable teaching plan, a program of religious education ranging from narrow physical self-preservation out through concern for others and up from the crudest animal want to high spiritual value.

If the parent, already familiar with the religious attitude of trust in God and having a steady faith in the possibilities of the child to grow in wisdom, will take each of these desires as a holy challenge, spiritual results will soon follow. What is the religious parent's or religious teacher's function just there? Functions here, in the main, are the same functions which exist for all teachers everywhere. At one point only is there a difference. The religious person will have a more inclusive hierarchy of values—a longer series of loyalties. Religion holds that the series must not cease until the ultimate is

reached. Religion is idealization. That is one of its major functions. The home or school dedicated to religion must function as a religious educator of children if our civilization is ever to become Christian. Here then is a starting place. Let the pastor gain a knowledge of the *goals* entertained by each school grade on the one hand, and on the other hand know the innate *desires* of the growing child or youth in the family. Such a pastor, devoting time to vital education, could bring a nonprofessional enthusiasm to the learning process. By this service the pastor could definitely enter into the broad education of the whole community. Actually, this is progressive education. It would be one step ahead of the class or of the formal instruction which travels along the established paths of courses, periods, assignments, and recitations. The Christian zeal which first created schools returning in our decade to awaken our homes to a zeal for normal growth might renew education.

IV. *The Pastor's Procedure in Counseling*

How will the pastor enter this larger service? Three types of pastoral calls should engage us. (1) *The pursuit call*. This is the time-honored going from house to house. It will never pass from the Church. If the vocational problems, the marital relations and child training were undertaken, pastoral visitation would take on vitality. The pastor who has skill in going into the home or office or shop with dispatch or definiteness of purpose, and of getting out promptly, leaving behind him both that sense of awe which pervades worship, and the idea that we are together in an urgent and important work, has succeeded. Not all can do this readily, though all should continually try to do it. Prayer in homes will never cease to be of the essence, but a naturalness, absence of form, and a quiet grace are essential. The lifting of the hand to heaven and the heart in petition at the door may introduce peace, restore power, or initiate a new attack on the problems which recur to a family. Offices need this service even more than homes do, but who is equal to it?

(2) More important is the *counseling call*. In this case the parishioner calls on the pastor. This is by far the better situation. The pastor will need to be in his study during specific hours. Precision in hour and method will help to hold the occasion above a chance meeting and remove it from mere sociability. The books should aid, not detract from, the interview. Your business is to manipulate the situation so as to achieve a religious or an ethical end. You have a moral right to influence human conduct. To salvage human life is a duty. Every other profession expects the ministry to do both pre-

ventive and remedial work. Here is a method whereby this duty can become creative. As the interview proceeds, it is often well to sketch in the main outline of the problem on a page and to gradually fit in details. The direct statement, "Let us get the facts out on the table," will tend to move any person far from such lesser interview purposes as gossip, repetition of a tale, or a vague desire to find out what the pastor knows of some social happening.

Every interview should have the *inner urge* of the pastor in it. That urge, however, should never be allowed to pull out of the person a confession. In every interview Christian hope should prevail. Faith is contagious. So is health. Be well. Believe. The immediate aim of the interview where consistent with the ultimate objective will be (a) To help the person achieve the fullest and most abundant life of which the person is capable; (b) to set the affections upon social usefulness and productivity; and (c) to attain to a permanent relationship of friendly intercourse with God—a God whose character is best made meaningful in the personality, teaching, and sacrificial conduct of Jesus Christ. The applicant will come again and again by appointment. The pastor will set the time. Regularity will strengthen the will.

(3) *The project interview* is a third method. For each person in a church a card record should be kept, just as a physician or a social case worker keeps a record. The skillful pastor will be able, by observing his patient in committee, in solitary duty, in a pageant or a drama, while making a brief address, or in conducting a social affair, to carry back to his file a vast amount of data. To use this in a way which will advance each person toward physical integration, mental control, emotional balance, spiritual insight, and a genuine soul productivity, is the skill which each of us should consider it his right and privilege to achieve. In this Jesus was master.

One of the values which under this form of pastoral work is of the greatest spiritual blessing is the *Cause*. That is, many a person, by being absorbed in a cause, comes into the proper relation to the universe, gets a vision, or steps out into the great family of God. His otherwise insignificant moods, once so petty, become the necessary detail of a vast enveloping enterprise, and the very elements that formerly had a tendency to scatter his energies, turn about to release energy and supply elements out of which faith and otherness produce unity. In a cause, the individual by the purpose of the cause and by the movement of persons and groups finds his own objective. The pastor in this respect becomes a social engineer, but he must likewise be a healer of souls, a workman reshaping men.

What, then, is this pastoral work in modern life? It is applied psychology, a science of the soul. It is the analysis of persons. It is the Christian experience of the minister at white heat set against the frozen assets of his constituency to thaw them into fluid, and start a renewing, a regenerating life coursing through society. Where it rises to the art of creative living and recreative experimentation it achieves wonders.

The pastoral work which we are fitting ourselves to perform must always be a schoolmaster function. The pastor must be engaged constantly in dividing the destructive influences from constructive ones, shifting the emphasis of a person or a group from damaging practice to enriching experience. Such leadership in faith can turn the sluggard and the brilliant alike away from the bad and the good and impel them consciously toward the idealistic and the best. It can and must set hope where defeat settled yesterday. At this stage pastoral work lifts discipline to romance, and carries men and groups toward practical Godlikeness.

I close by avoiding the issue of Christian solidarity on which the effectiveness of each pastor depends. I shall simply ask: Can our broken Christian line be patched, our divided house reunited at least in given communities so that Christian grace can be mediated, a religious interpretation offered and the *whole community* be softened as well as strengthened in high and holy social behavior? It is the office of pastors to become a staff of Christian leaders demonstrating Christian professional co-operation. They only can hope to shape a city according to the pattern of the Kingdom of God who attain something of that seriousness of purpose and precision of performance which we experience in a great medical clinic. Only concerted performance along the wide range of human need, rather than great individualistic pulpit pronouncement, can adequately serve our urban epoch.

A View of Europe

CHARLES C. SELCMAN

IN 1937 it was my privilege to traverse Europe by way of Athens, Stamboul, Budapest, Prague, Vienna, Berlin, Paris, and London, and thence to the two World Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh.

In July and August, 1939, I was again in Paris, Brussels, Berlin, Hamburg, and London, and also had several days in Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Oslo.

On these two visits there were many rare opportunities for contacts and observations. Without trying to pronounce verdict upon the incubation of world events, I do report the impressions of what I saw and heard in the lands visited.

Vienna plainly exhibited signs of depression and discouragement. However, the restaurants were full of well-dressed people and the prices were higher than in Athens or Constantinople. The Americans who visited the famous wine gardens informed us that these resorts too had many patrons, even to the wee small hours.

In Prague, through the kindness of a Methodist missionary, Dr. Joseph P. Bartak, we had the delightful experience and high honor of an invitation to four o'clock tea at the palace of President Liberator Masaryk. This home, given him upon his voluntary retirement in 1935, is a castle of the former Kings of Bohemia. Our hostess, Doctor Masaryk, daughter of the President, explained that her father, then in his eighty-seventh year, no longer received guests, but that we might see him after tea as he took his daily drive in company with his nurse. We stood a short way down the garden walk, and presently a carriage drawn by two white horses came by. The venerable hero lifted his hat in response to our salute. In three short months this famous statesman, who was said to have "the finest intellect of the century," passed into the other world, and was spared the pangs of being a witness to his country's humiliation. The picture we caught as he passed us that day in June, 1937, is said to mark the last time he was photographed. Masaryk grew up in poverty. His father was a coachman, his mother a cook. As a boy he was helper in a blacksmith's shop. He is one of a group of strong men in Europe who came up from the underprivileged strata of society and found opportunity and fame.

In 1937, we reached Berlin on July 1, the day of Martin Niemoeller's arrest. Not much was being said of it. Even visitors in Germany do not talk freely of such matters. One guide, answering my innocent inquiry, said "He meddled in politics." At any rate, he was promptly and quietly disposed of by being deprived of pulpit, home, liberty, and freedom of speech.

The International Chamber of Commerce was in session in Berlin at this time. The pastor of the American Church kindly furnished me a ticket to the elaborate banquet of this organization. Many prominent leaders were in evidence, mostly from the business world of Europe and America. It was my good fortune to sit by the manager of a great American chain store company, who was in charge of their business in Germany. Much conversation at the table bore upon the change of management of the largest department store in the city, which was required to dispose of a controlling interest in its stock to non-Jews as a result of a plebiscite in which all employees voted under government orders and supervision. The result was obviously inevitable. "For one thing," remarked a banqueter, "a Jew store cannot fly the swastika, and who wants to work under such restrictions?" Even at that time it was difficult to meet Jewish business friends at lunch. Only a few restaurants admitted Jews. If one went to their designated places he was suspected.

The afternoon of July Fourth Ambassador and Mrs. W. E. Dodd held open house to their American friends. The Stars and Stripes were in evidence and comment was free and unrestrained. "It cannot last," bellowed one government attache above the din of conversation, "no human ingenuity can perpetuate such a complicated system of control extending to every detail of human life. The totalitarian State is doomed to fall of its own weight." It was my impression that the sooner it fell the more pleased he would be. Doctor Dodd was plainly ill at ease in a nation that violated all his conceptions of justice and democracy. He had too wide a knowledge of history and had drunk too deeply from the same fountain with Woodrow Wilson to watch the antics of a dictator with anything less than scornful amusement, or, perhaps I should say, indignant disgust.

As I write this the morning paper is delivered. It announces the death of Dr. William E. Dodd, and repeats the scathing criticism of Senator Borah, in which he calls Dodd "an irresponsible scoundrel." There are many who will not agree with the lately deceased Mr. Borah. In fact, they may venture the opinion that if Dodd rather than Borah had shaped our American policy and opinion, Hitler might not have ventured so far.

One other incident in Berlin shows how the 1937 wind was blowing. An invitation came to me to speak at the Rotary Club, which was to meet on Tuesday. But my schedule required my presence in London on a given date. This influenced us to leave on Monday. Had I remained it would have been my lot to be the last speaker at the Berlin Rotary Club. An order was issued for its suppression. Too much internationalism!

In Paris we made three visits to the Exposition, still unfinished, due largely to labor troubles. We spent a considerable portion of our time in the Russian and German buildings that stood grimly facing each other near the main entrance. There they stood all finished and ready in the midst of an unfinished exposition. They seemed to advertise the efficiency and ease with which dictators operate. There was a passionate readiness of Russian guides to explain and commend their manner of life. It seemed deep and genuine. One turns away asking, "What is this new way? Where does it lead?" Do we have the answer in Poland and Finland? Or do the people know where they are being led? In this connection I recall a rather pathetic conversation with a Japanese teacher in Kyoto. He was a teacher in a great university. He had a Ph.D. from America. After one or two brief conversations I ventured to inquire, "What is your government going to do in the Orient?" This was after Manchukuo and before the Chinese incident. He became quite serious; then, looking all about the waiting room, evidently to be sure no one heard him, he remarked in a muffled voice: "We do not know. You people in other countries know more about our national policy than we who live here." That seems to be the tragedy of an autocracy. People are cattle. They are not presumed to have opinions, much less to voice them. For example, Hermann Rauschning, former president of the Danzig Senate, in *The Revolution of Nihilism*, says: "Today in Germany any criticism, even from the noblest and most genuine of patriots, is accounted one of the worst of crimes, and placed in the same category as high treason." The bloody events of June 30, 1934, give some color to the above quotation. If ever the full story of that cruel purge is told the world will shudder with horror.

In London, through the courtesy of Mr. H. R. Knickerbocker, famous International News correspondent, I had two rare experiences in July, 1937. One was a luncheon with Randolph Churchill, son of Winston Churchill, in his bachelor apartments. Randolph Churchill is on the staff of one of the great London dailies. The thoughtful host had provided Coca-Cola for the Methodist minister from America. He had probably heard that I was one

of those interesting monstrosities, an American prohibitionist. Three eminent journalists sat for two and one-half hours discussing Germany, Russia, war, peace, airplanes, submarines, armaments, navies, forts, world markets, raw materials, colonies, and so forth. Here for the first time I heard the expression of a vague fear of a rapprochement between Hitler and Stalin. These men, whose business it is to keep their sensitive fingertips upon the pulse of the planet, already felt the chill of the sinister shadow of Stalin, Lenin and Karl Marx falling across the map of Europe. Who dares to say what black plagues shall visit the earth before that shadow is lifted? One could not breathe the atmosphere of London, Paris, and Berlin in 1937 and come away with a definite sense of optimism.

From the luncheon we proceeded to the House of Lords, where Lord Halifax was discoursing in no very spirited fashion on the international situation. It was somewhat amusing to hear the speakers in the House of Commons refer to the House of Lords as "another place." An ancient conflict still dwells in their language despite their decades of co-ordinated legislative history. But the climax came in the House of Commons, where Mr. Ormsby Gore was presenting the report of the Royal Commission on the Partitioning of Palestine. The age-old question of the Jews was confronted with characteristic English diplomacy and candor. From the gallery I looked down on Anthony Eden, Winston Churchill, Lloyd George, Lady Astor, Neville Chamberlain, and others whose names are known around the world. According to the London *Times* Ormsby Gore's speech on this vexing question "approximated the high-water mark of oratory in the House of Commons." What a great people the Jews are. What woes they have suffered. What perplexing issues they raise. Approximately sixteen million of them scattered among the nations, they have made a contribution to civilization far out of proportion to their numbers in music, art, letters, science, statesmanship and finance. But generation after generation they are misunderstood, maltreated, hated, persecuted. They constitute the enigma of history. What would happen to them and to the world if they should suddenly embrace One who "came unto his own and his own received him not"?

As a further background to some observations I may make later in this paper, I mention a dinner at a select London club with Sir Linden and Lady Macassey, an eminent jurist who is an authority on labor problems, and a member of the governing board of The University of London. In company with many American delegates to the World Conferences, we passed down

the long line in the gardens of Lambeth Palace and were presented to his lordship, the Archbishop of Canterbury. On two occasions we heard him in historic Saint Paul's.

Later, at Edinburgh, there came the opportunity to lodge at the same student hostel with Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of York. Before the fortnight passed I had a chance to make an inquiry concerning a certain statement that I had seen in an American newspaper. A noted English preacher had been quoted as saying that if America had not entered the World War peace would have come sooner and on more satisfactory terms. His answer was in substance: "I would not say we would have had an earlier peace, but the treaty would doubtless have been one of negotiation rather than one of coercion." As one who followed the A. E. F. to France, and who saw the maimed bodies of our brave sons, and also those thousands of white crosses row on row, it gave me a definite emotional depression.

So much for 1937. Let us pass to the summer of 1939. This includes a trip on the *Bremen*, New York to Cherbourg, and a return on the same ship, August 23 to 28. John Gunther describes August 21 to 27 as "the tremendous week." This return trip of the *Bremen* was her last voyage until she crept back through fog and icebergs to Murmansk and later to Hamburg. The brief entry in my diary August 28 is "Today on ship much concern about war. Many wireless messages. Mrs. Fondren had a phone call from Houston. We landed at 6 P. M., all safe." But I cannot soon forget those German sailor boys, who scanned the meager pages of the daily bulletin for news from London, Paris, and Berlin. Their eager faces wore a seriousness, deep and wistful.

There came a time of insight into the attitude of the German people on the cruise ship *Milwaukee*. For twenty-three days we sailed the North Sea and the Arctic Ocean. Weather conditions were ideal. The sea was calm. The seven hundred or more passengers, nearly all German business and professional folk on vacation, were in a mood to eat and rest and play. What eaters they were! One American who visits much in Berlin said that for them it was the open season for eating. Well, they made the best of it. A retired military officer from America, who has been living in Germany, gave us many insights into the shortage of food, particularly butter, fruit, meat, and coffee. A family of five could buy one pound of butter per week and about two pork chops twice a week. There was an even greater shortage of coffee, milk, cream, and cheese. Even people who were producers of milk were not

permitted to use more than the stipulated quantity at home. The rest must be delivered through the proper channels for the public good.

In conversation with a doctor on the ship, I remarked upon the great contribution of Berlin, Vienna, and other scientific centers to the progress of medical science. This doctor shrugged his shoulders and said, "That used to be, but it is no more. Many of our most learned men have been driven out." This same process has affected the whole educational system in Germany, as well as the newspapers, which are under the strictest supervision. In fact, no one dares publicly or privately to express an adverse opinion or one contrary to government policy. Even travelers have to talk with the greatest care. We were told of one American citizen who was taken off the train and put in jail merely for asking questions.

Two New England schoolteachers who had been visiting relatives in Germany told numerous stories of the unhappiness and anxiety of the older people of Germany. The young people for the most part seem to be full of enthusiasm and loyalty, ready to fight and die, if necessary, to uphold Hitler and his system. I conversed with numerous American travelers who felt, as we did, a sort of smothering sense while in Germany.

In Berlin and Hamburg, the two cities we visited, we had no difficulty in securing wholesome food in good quantities. When we left Germany we could not take more than eight marks of German money with us. You register your money in and register your money out. They keep a very close check on you in that respect. With any additional funds you are permitted to buy boat money, a sort of scrip which is used instead of money on German ships.

Our cruise, which took us to Iceland and Spitzbergen, was finished at Copenhagen in time for the All-European Methodist Conference, August 2 to 6. To a landlubber from America this large, well-dressed assembly was something of a surprise. "It would be trite to say that we are living in a new world. For centuries the term, *the new world*, applied to America. Today the new world is not across the Atlantic. It is right here. We are living in it. The last quarter of a century has witnessed more and vastly profounder changes in Europe than in America or any other part of the world." These ringing sentences from the Episcopal Address carry the heartbeat of our heroic brothers in these war-vexed lands. What this upheaval will do for them or for European Christianity, who would venture to predict?

In Paris, Berlin, and London we felt the pulse of people resolutely resigned to the grim specter of another war. Camouflaged entrances to

spacious underground places of refuge were discerned. Observation balloons were tethered to earth along Hyde Park. Papers bore screaming headlines of conditions in Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and elsewhere. Crowds gathered before Buckingham Palace and filled all available space in Downing Street, where at the famous "No. 10" sat Chamberlain, Halifax, and others in profound deliberation. On the afternoon of August 22—just ten days before war was declared—I took a taxi from Piccadilly Circus and was delivered squarely in front of "No. 10 Downing Street." I was somewhat discomfited when I observed some forty London policemen, "the bobbies," quite busy supervising the growing throng. However, knowing that I had a newspaper commission, I calmly proceeded to ask curious questions of bystanders in good old American fashion. And everyone was ready to talk. All were resigned to war. All were ready to face calmly what seemed an unavoidable necessity to resort to arms and meet force with force. That seemed to be the temper of the English, just a calm determination to face the issue and settle matters at whatever cost of time, money or human life. There were no boasts or threats or parades, just a resolute decision to make no further concessions to what seemed to them the brutal encroachments of force.

A view of Europe! If one could content himself with a superficial view it could be painted in such soft and pleasing colors. There are fertile fields whose soil has not been wasted and eroded, but preserved and built up for centuries. There are the deep-shaded forests that yield an annual income, and yet are perpetual forests. Such a thing as "cut over" land is unknown in Europe.

Such lovely villages with people living simple, unhurried, deliberate lives on small incomes! All one day, from Sofia to Budapest, we watched from the train window for autos on the highways and saw less than a dozen in as many hours. Trudging in wooden shoes or heavy brogans from their low thatched houses or tiled cottages to orchard, meadow or field, these quiet peasant folk plod on from generation to generation. Little quarrel have they with Germany, France, Russia or England until some officer with sword and buckler calls forth their sunburned sons to bear arms and learn the bloody art of human butchery. This summer I studied those representatives of twenty-one nations on Continental Europe, at our Copenhagen Methodist Conference. Those preachers with such long Prince Albert coats and solemn looks. Those young people full of song and dealing so freely and generously with each other. What wicked witches have stirred the brew and set these same folk to

building Siegfried and Maginot Lines, to scattering vagrant mines upon the ocean, to sailing overhead and underseas, dealing death blows to old women, hospital patients and school children? What has transformed those Laplanders who herd reindeer and train their timid children to sell postcards to tourists, into an armed host on snowshoes?

For one thing, Europe has too many little nations, too many fortified frontiers, too many governments, too many armies. Germany is, or was, surrounded by thirteen little countries. Perhaps Clarence K. Streit, author of *Union Now*, is wise in his plea for a union of North Atlantic democracies in five fields—citizenship, defense force, customs, money, and communication systems. He argues that it would be unworthy of us to expect the British and French governments to preserve the peace and safety for us. If the League is to be abandoned, some international machinery must take its place with sufficient police force to give it authority.

Another impression which I carried away is that there is too much marching in Europe. "Marching kills thought," says Rauschning. "Marching makes an end of individuality." Those marching boys and girls in the Strength through Joy movement are becoming a part of a huge machine. They are merging themselves into a vast moving mass that defies all opposition and crushes reasonable criticism. Hitler probably has been shrewd enough to foresee this. But he has doubtless not seen that ultimately it may involve his overthrow.

One further observation. The majorities are helpless in an autocracy. It is the majority, not the minority, that needs protection. Once let a cunning cruel minority gain control of the machinery of coercion and communication, no one dares undertake a counter movement. How long would Trotsky last in Russia today? In that "clash of world forces," as Basil Mathews describes it, no one dares to dissent. One cannot read *Reaching for the Stars*, by Norma Waln, without the conviction that thousands of gentlefolk in Germany are dejected and long for a new order. But they cannot forget June 30, 1934.

There is one further observation. Hitler, as some believe, has probably signed his own death warrant. What then? There stands Stalin. There looms Russia. There lurks Communism, a religion without a God or a future life. If England and France fail, God pity India; God pity America; God save the world.

The Incompetence of Nature

JOSEPH M. M. GRAY

FOR the purpose of this discussion, let us divest ourselves, as far as possible, of all the predilections, assumptions, and habits of reference which are associated with the religious tradition in which we have been reared and the religious convictions to which we are committed. For our religious tradition and convictions gather around the reality of the supernatural, as an axiom of thought and life; and I am not interested in arguing before untroubled Christians a confirmation of the faith they have not questioned. I am concerned with pointing out something of the obvious which the genuine skeptic rather easily overlooks; and also with offering some suggestions to those whose religious certainty is clouded or whose religious adventure is imperiled by their acceptance of a naturalism, or perhaps it would be better to say an unrecognized materialism, with which the idea of the supernatural is incongruous.

It is well, moreover, thus to divest ourselves of our religious prepossessions, for we can never successfully meet the genuine skeptic unless we can meet him on his own ground; and the full power and climate of our religious convictions and inheritance make it easy for Christian people to overestimate the strength of their apologetics. We must appreciate, as the skeptic does, that a discussion of the supernatural cannot end in proof; it can conclude with no more than an inference. Which, of course, is true, from the intellectual viewpoint, of the religious experience itself.

You may be thinking, immediately and in contradiction, of the authority with which the religious experience witnesses the reality of God—that self-attesting experience which Dr. George A. Gordon called the sublime dialogue within the soul that constitutes the heart of religion. In its most vehement witness it is the mystic experience in which the mystic finds himself so immediately conscious of the Divine Presence that he describes it by saying that he is lost in God. But for all the sanctity which centuries of usage have given the phrase, it is still inaccurate. Saint Paul had such an experience, which he described by saying that he knew a man “(whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth) . . . how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not

lawful for a man to utter." But while he did not know whether the man was in the body or out of the body, he knew who the man was. No matter how vivid and overwhelming the mystic experience may be, as Bishop McConnell has somewhere said, the mystic who claims to be lost in God, always knows who is lost. This certainty that it is in God that he is lost is possible to the mystic himself only as the result of a process of reasoning and inference, swift and intuitive as it may be. For when any man believes or declares that he has experienced God, what has happened is that he has had an experience of such a kind that he believes only what he means by God could account for it, and that is itself an inference.

"What I seek, I know not,
Save that it is unseen and flawless . . . and uncrowned . . .
Some great perfection of pure form or color or sound
Or odor, of the soul and body; so my limbs may slake
At last their thirst for touch, so that my heart may flame!"

The inference may be and, I presume, for all of us here, is so powerful and cogent as to justify our conduct of life and thought upon it. Certainly there can be no argument against our doing so based upon any mystery or difficulty in the notion of the supernatural itself. As Thomas Huxley said, long ago, "Whosoever clearly appreciates all that is implied in the falling of a stone can have no difficulty about any doctrine simply on account of its marvelousness." The credibility of the supernatural is a matter simply of evidence supplying cogent and commanding probability.

So much for what Farmer Snowe, nodding over his pipe and ale in Blackmore's lovely romance, would call the "praliminaries." Now to our definitions. What do we mean by "natural"? What do we mean by "supernatural"? It will not be hard to find and to accept certain definitions; but we must not forget that they are the result of protracted and very complex intellectual processes, the benefit of which we inherit but the cost of which we do not realize. As Rudolf Otto put it in his memorable volume on *The Idea of the Holy*, "The conception of nature as a single connected system of events united by laws is the final and most difficult outcome of abstraction."

It is that idea of a single connected system which constitutes the core of any definition of nature, and we can do no better than go back to a mind much earlier than Otto's and, with the omission of a word which his theological loyalty required, repeat Horace Bushnell's language that nature is that "realm of being or substance which has an acting, a going on or process from

within itself and by its own laws." It follows inevitably, then, that the supernatural is whatever, by the necessities of its own being or activity, cannot be in the chain of natural cause and effect, or whatever, as Bushnell again said, "acts on the chain of cause and effect, in nature, from without the chain." The definition expressly excludes the supernatural. Unless it did so we should be guilty of hiding our conclusion in the premise and of pulling it out, at last, as a sort of rabbit-in-a-hat, instead of developing it by more reasonable processes. But with a definition to which the most ardent antagonist of the supernatural can agree, we safeguard the integrity of our search and, if our logic holds, that of our conclusion.

The significance of the title given to this address, therefore, becomes not only clear but painfully obvious. It is the incompetence of nature to account for whatever may lie outside the chain of natural cause and effect, or whatever acts on it from without the chain.

I

That understanding of nature, obvious as it is, however, is pretty much submerged beneath either of two familiar moods with which, at one time or another, we are generally occupied. It is frequently overlooked by those who are absorbed in the processes of nature, as those processes are illumined by the researches of science, on the one hand, and, on the other, employed in the direction of natural energies to the uses if not always to the benefit of human life. The achievements of physics and chemistry in mechanical invention in new combinations of material usefulness and value; the employment of increasing knowledge of biological conditions and laws in the improvement of species and the mastery of disease; have resulted in a fairly common overestimate of the range and capability of natural energies and processes. In themselves and in the unlimited development of knowledge and power which they are presumed to open to patient exploration, they are considered sufficient to account for all things within the attainment and experience of men. And to such a mood, which is by no means limited to professional scientists and, indeed, not altogether held by them, this phrase, "The Incompetence of Nature," would be a contradiction in terms. Such a mood not only regards nature as a single connected system of events united by laws, but rejects, tacitly at least, the possibility that there may be some effective reality outside the system. The minds in which that mood is habitual may be as humble as Newton, though they frequently are not, but in their utterances one is reminded of

the old gardener whom J. B. Priestley encountered in his *English Journey*, who spoke of nature, so Priestley said, "as if he had been a member of the small committee that had appointed her."

Again, this idea of the incompetence of nature is submerged beneath what may be called the romantic view of it; a view far more popularly held than is the scientific mood. It is a view, also, which has long been inspired and sustained by poetry and the pulpit. As Paul Elmer More remarked, in quite another connection, "We have been poisoned by our poets." We have been betrayed into false values by emotions evoked through subtle tacit interpretations of natural beauty.

"O to mount again where erst I haunted;
Where the old red hills are bird-enchanted,
And the low, green meadows
Bright with sward;
And when even dies, the million-tinted,
And the night has come, and planets glinted,
Lo, the valley hollow
Lamp-bestarr'd!

"O to dream, O to wake and wander
There, and with delight to take and render,
Through the trance of silence,
Quiet breath!
Lo, for there, among the flowers and grasses,
Only the mightier movement sounds and passes,
Only winds and rivers,
Life and death."

Or we are betrayed into unjustifiable imputations of meaning in nature, as we read something at once beautiful, insidious and vague, like Edna St. Vincent Millay's *God's World*.

When one comes to such lines with memories of Crater Lake or the Königssee, or the Jungfrau in the sunset, or Mount Rainier with dawn breaking on its eternal snow, or of where, below King Arthur's Castle, Hawker's great sea sobs like a sleeping vassal at his master's gate, it is a very disciplined intelligence that does not overvalue what it sees and feels.

Or again we surrender to the spell of poetry relating nature to some aspect of solemn and mysterious human experience:

"The hills,
Rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun; the vales
Streaching in pensive quietness between;

The venerable woods; rivers that move
In majesty, and the complaining brooks
That make the meadows green; and poured round all,
Old ocean's grey and melancholy waste—
Are but the solemn decorations all
Of the great tomb of man."

As for the preachers, do we not continually saturate our congregations' thoughts with metaphor and trope and simile that mislead docile and incautious minds into the belief that nature is a revelation when, in reality, it is only the convenient vehicle of what we or they themselves have imputed to it? Hear George H. Morrison, for instance, telling his congregation this: "Some one is calling where the winds are sighing; some one is moving where the leaves are rustling; some one is yearning toward the human heart where the waves are breaking on the shore." A sentence like that is irresistible; but what has actually happened? Why, in the positive Christian conviction out of which his preaching and the interest of his congregation alike arise, the preacher has assumed, as he had a right to assume, though from quite other premises, the fact and personality of God; and to him and to those who hear him, nature is a vehicle of revelation of the God whom they have already taken for granted.

But our discussion assumes nothing except the credibility of our senses and of the experiences of our human kind. It begins with nature as it is discovered to be and discerns that, of necessity, a realm of being or substance which has an acting, a going on or process from within itself and by its own laws, can reveal nothing of whatever may be outside or other than itself. If the supernatural is a reality, it can be known only through effects which evidence themselves within the framework of nature in which we are fixed, but the origin of which cannot be discovered within that framework. Or, reversing the order of ideas, if we shall find effects within the framework of nature, the origins of which are not discoverable therein, we have the right to infer that their origin is outside of nature and hence in some way is supernatural. It is the premise of whatever argument shall appear that such effects are inextricable from our knowledge and experience of the world in which we live, and the incompetence of nature to account for their origin makes inevitable the inference of supernatural reality.

II

In support of such an assertion I shall begin where you expect me to

begin, with the trite, familiar and unsolvable problem of life itself. Nature is incompetent to account for the origins of life which is already present when any inquiry begins and which refers the inquirer to a beginning not discoverable within the natural chain of cause and effect.

No pageantry depicting the accomplishments of man surpasses in magnificence or fascination the report which science makes of the progress of living forms from "the dark backward and abyss of time" to the latest bright morning of the world. The poetry of it, prophetic in its anticipation of what lay hidden behind centuries of ignorance, is in the Norse legend of the life-tree Yggdrasill which, "wide-waving," as Carlyle wrote it, "many-toned, has its roots down deep in the Death-kingdoms, among the oldest dead dust of men, and with its bough reaches always beyond the stars, and in all times and places is one and the same life-tree." But the undecorated and even dull prose of modern science is vibrant with drama, solemnized by the ruthless tragedy which haunts every advancing stage, and significant in every chapter of the incorrigible mind of man, exploring, with illimitable patience, the farthest reaches of his universe, so mysterious, so splendid, and so vast. In the discoverable beginning—note the adjective—in the discoverable beginning of an evolutionary process with the story of which we are all familiar, is that first, simple unitary cell, unconscious, yet sensate and alive; a single point of animate existence in a world incredibly immense. The now familiar report records the slow march of millenniums, age after age, eon after eon, until only eternity suggests a more incomprehensible duration. And slowly, by infinitesimal accretions of form and function, by infinitesimal variations of shape and structure, the hosts of species adapt themselves to climate, soil, topography and sustenance, and the animal world is here; while behind them, in the long pilgrimage of physical progress, are the innumerable lost battalions of nature's trial and error, the inadequate species defeated in the struggle to survive. That is a very kindergarten sort of summary of a process no less complex because its general outline is so familiar and widely accepted.

But, poetry and prose alike, it is a magnificent, dramatic history, no mere wonder tale, but the supreme epic reported by the mind of man. And with allowance for a reasonable proportion of error, and due consideration for the areas yet remaining into which the exploration has not fully penetrated, the essential truth of the report is beyond doubt. Nature, to use a general phrase and one not wholly in good repute, without commitment to any particular statement of evolutionary theory, does exhibit the survival of the fit. But it has

no satisfactory explanation of the arrival of that first unitary living existence from which all succeeding forms have risen into the struggle to survive. Nothing of all the splendid evolution which has followed it accounts for its presence. For the physical order itself creates nothing new; what may seem so is redistribution of stuff already here, not creation. At that frontier nature and the human mind together can only stare, voiceless, like lost explorers gazing on some alien, unhorizoned sea.

What I have just said is not merely a linguistic performance more akin to sound and fury than to genuine significance. It reflects a judgment based upon the ascertainable data with which the most exhaustive scientific inquiry has to do. Hear Henri Bergson, who cannot be charged with any religious prepossessions: "The more science advances, the more it sees the heterogeneous elements which are placed together, outside each other, to make up a living being. Does science thus get any nearer life? Does it not, to the contrary, find that what is really life in the living seems to recede with every step by which it pushes further the detail of the parts combined?" Bergson has another word which, while not necessary to the argument, is relevant to the aims of this discussion. Paley's famous watch in his discussion of theism has been a pariah in the classrooms and laboratories of a generation. Like a lewd fellow of the baser sort who has crashed the gate into some elite company, it has been thrown out with more violence than consideration. But you cannot get rid of a watchmaker by throwing his watch out of the window; and while Bergson would probably deny any kinship with Paley, he speaks a language Paley would approve. It is in his remark that he saw in the whole evolution of life on our planet an effort to arrive at what is only realizable in man. But whose effort? Or, if we must keep our theism out of the inquiry, the effort of what? In such an observation, however unintentional on Bergson's part, the banished argument from evidences of design returns. Those evidences, the data which they represent, supernaturalism can explain; naturalism must explain them away.

III

So much, for the moment, in the realm of biology; the argument continues in that of physics. The presence of motion throughout nature is indispensable to its very constitution as we know it; yet of the ultimate origin of motion, as of that of life, nature can give no account. It is safe to remark that intelligence, or perhaps it would be better to say awareness of objects,

first registers in the recognition of motion; and once intelligence is awakened, the world is always, to a greater or less degree, in action. The blade of grass, the summer foliage or the fluttering leaves of autumn, the winds that sing or hardly whisper as they pass above Stevenson's bird-enchanted hills, the birds themselves which, from dawn until dark, are never motionless, the clouds that Shelley saw, the sifting atoms of disintegrated granite that Ruskin followed from their Alpine peaks to the fertile valleys far below, James Whitcomb Riley's tiny, flying motes among the sycamores—such common things compose the multitudinous reality of the everyday world. Motion is never absent from the scene. There is no such thing as still life. That is an artist's phrase, but it corresponds to no reality. The stillness is itself a theater of motion no less real for being invisible.

Unceasing also, though also unseen, unfelt but inexorable and constant, are the forces which make the inanimate world a realm of motion, through what we call occurrences or accidents or the familiar operations of nature. The shifts and thrusts of gravitation that release an avalanche or pull a cascade down the mountainside or bring a wounded partridge to the ground;

"the grating roar
Of pebbles which the waves draw back, and fling,
At their return, up the high strand"

of Dover Beach; Old Man River as he keeps rolling along—all are responsive to some imperious behest obedience to which is motion.

It is all very trite and not at all inspiring to us, but it is impossible to imagine the revolution in the mind and life of the man and his contemporaries who first intelligently raised their eyes above the landscape by which they were surrounded and realized that, beyond their own physical activities and those of the animal world about them; beyond the slides and falls and thrusts of their inanimate world; the very skies above them were alive with motion. The spectacle, to the first awakened minds, of the sun marching across the mysterious expanse of space, must have awakened emotions into which we cannot now enter. And when the man with mathematics in his mind and a telescope in his hand contradicted the observation of centuries and declared that, not the sun but the solid, fixed earth was whirling on an endless journey, history records the unanimous, impassioned denial which he met. The worst that can be said about the Reverend John Jasper, crying from his nineteenth-century pulpit that the sun do move, is that he was an anachronism. Of a hundred centuries of civilized mankind, not five have entirely believed that the earth is not sta-

tionary. John Jasper would have been at home with incredibly more generations of human thought than we should be. And when men discovered, in contradiction of their sight, their common sense and their reason, that not the earth alone but the sun and the innumerable suns and stars that blazed above them, were all in motion, wheeling in ordered magnificence through distances beyond the apprehension of the mind, what a drama was presented to intelligence and credulity!

Our own times have been confronted with no less amazing disclosures. The magnificence beyond our globe is matched by the marvels within its most trivial fragment. And there, too, motion is the meaning of it all. Every atom is a universe of power and speed. What was once the solid structure of imperishable matter is discovered now to be but the theater of unceasing activity, and all the ever-so-solid objects apprehended by the senses are but fluid cages of imprisoned energies in co-ordinated flight. Matter was the name which, in our ignorance, we gave to what, in reality, is motion, and our cosmos is but incalculable energy, storming, organized, along productive pathways of the infinite and infinitesimal alike.

With what respect must we regard the minds whose daring and patient exploration has brought such incredibilities into common knowledge! Can anything be beyond the range of their discoveries! But at the farthest reach of the exploring mind, at the edge of the cosmos which has surrendered to the inquisitions of such an inescapable search, the origin of motion remains unknown. The electron says, *It is not in me!* The solar worlds that whirl in all the guise of freedom cry, *It is not with us!* The vibrant and moving universe can only point to the frontier no search has crossed, and signal that the answer lies there. The realm of being, with its acting, going on or process from within itself and by its own laws, cannot account for this characteristic, indispensable feature of its own constitution. The origin of motion does not lie within the chain of natural cause and effect. Whether it projects or pervades within the frame of nature, its origin lies outside the chain.

Except in the one mysterious reality of the human will. There we *do* have an origination of motion. I will; and my hand moves. I will; and a whole series of quiescent muscles leap to life, communicating motion, releasing power, and changing the very face and atmosphere of nature itself. A man wills and moves; and the engine starts, a cannon rains destruction on a village thirty miles away, an airplane rises, piano keys initiate a thousand atmospheric vibrations and a Brahms Requiem is re-created, a brush upon a canvas evokes a

Nocturne in Blue and Gold. The will originates motion, and the world of human achievement ensues. But the explanation of that origin is still wanting, as it was in Browning's Old Yellow Book:

"Since how heart moves brain and how both move hand,
What mortal ever in entirety saw?"

Can it be that motion leads at last to where, beyond the impenetrable frontier of things, there is another originating and effective Will?

Even mechanistic determinism, if there remains any relic of such a philosophy, points to the same inquiry. The human will, it declares, is not free. Its action, which seems so voluntary and originative, is itself the inescapable product of inevitable controls. But where did the controls begin, and from what control did motion then ultimately arise? Such questions are the very alphabet of naïve curiosity; but determinism only lands the mind in front of the same invulnerable frontier. Nature is incompetent. It can only suggest that the answer which it cannot give lies with some awesome reality outside its own processes and laws.

IV

Let us move on again. As we have traveled from biology to physics, let us turn to human experience. In the scientist's modern triumph over the theologian, nature claims man as wholly her own; his form and structure a product of the long, devious evolutionary process, the operations of his muscle and of his mind alike confined within the chain of natural cause and effect. As Stuart Sherman said, "The great task of the nineteenth century was to get man into nature; that of the twentieth is to get him out again."

Of course, we cannot get him out, but we can point to an inextricable factor in his humanness and ask how it got in; for nature itself cannot account for it. That is the factor of religion. The historian may describe the variations of religions through the race; he may appraise the effects of religion on social progress; he may discriminate the accretions which it gathers in the course of centuries, the differing institutions through which it expresses itself, the accumulations of error which, from time to time, it discards. He may trace its dynamic and pervasive influences in all the areas of human relationship and effort. He may discover again and again when and how some sacrificial or social or doctrinal or liturgical expression of religion appeared; dating and describing a Moses, a Buddha, a Mohammed, Jesus, a Mrs. Eddy or a Father Divine. But however wide may be his explorations, to whatever

remote period he pushes back his inquiry, he cannot reach a place in time of which to say, Here religion began. For religion, to use a phraseology from my younger days which has not yet been contradicted, "Religion is a datum, not a problem of history."

It was already here when man became conscious of his own mind and of the emotions which stirred within him. When men first reflected on the content of their world and themselves they realized that religion was an item in their earliest awareness; it was something they discovered within them, not something they evolved. Their earliest undisciplined inquiry as to what religion is, its significance and its credibility, was an inquiry into intimations by which they were already haunted. It was what Rudolf Otto has called the shudder and glow which wakened the inquisitive self-consciousness to the exploration.

I am not here concerned for definitions, or with the several interpretations of the word itself. The word is later than that which it presumes to explain; and when you have exhausted the offerings of etymology you have only dissected a description, you have not necessarily apprehended that which is described. What concerns us is religion itself, not the name it bears. It is quite relevant to reverse an observation of Paul Elmer More's and say that while the surest defense of religion against critical attack may be found in a more intellectual comprehension of its structure, its driving force would seem to be connected with something unanalyzable at its heart. That of which neither history nor the sciences can inform us, which nature can never explain without a contradiction in terms, is how, within nature itself as a realm of being which has an acting, a going on or process from within itself and by its own laws, the wholly natural mind could so much as conceive the idea of a supernatural which lies at the very heart of the datum of religion.

Obviously the notion of the supernatural cannot be included within the range of natural cause and effect, for its fundamental reference is beyond nature. Yet this notion of religion is an indisputable factor in human experience, finding expression in further and practical experiences, in illuminations of the mind of particular quality and range, and in re-creations of will toward a particular sort of ideals of life and standards of action. No reasonable account of them can be given without the hypothesis that for them and their fluctuations there is an objective cause. What Doctor Brightman has said about God seems applicable to whatever may be the cause of this datum of religion, namely, that what is true about it can neither contradict the special

sciences nor yet be derived from them. If the origin of religion is not discoverable in nature, if the notion of the supernatural can not be located within the chain of natural cause and effect, nevertheless an originating cause must exist.

There is still another consideration to be noted. Religion, this shudder and glow inextricable from the consciousness of man, makes itself felt as more than feeling, more than a subjective experience the awareness of which is innate. In an outmoded novel of many years ago, George MacDonald wrote of a certain east wind that it had "a shadow wind along with it that blows in the minds of men." This awareness of religion blows like a shadow wind in the minds of men and brings with it a sense of communication. Realization may seem to be by accident, but it is not a discovery; it is a constituent of the discoverer. One becomes aware of that which is within, and as Huckleberry Finn said of the wind that lonely night on the river, it seems to be trying to tell us something. And once again we are at the frontier, with religion, not as an hypothesis or an assumption of faith but as a datum of history pointing beyond nature to an undiscerned source. It is not at all indispensable but it is germane to the discussion and to the basic evolutionary theory, to quote here Dr. H. H. Farmer's word, that "We have not got to the heart of religion until we understand that it is the movement of man's spirit into an environment which includes and is greater than this world, and which, therefore, is adequate, and brings harmony and satisfaction to those powers which have outgrown this world altogether." Religion, like motion, faces us at last with the inquiry about a Will beyond the world.

So our exploration comes to the end which was forecast at the beginning—an inference, not a demonstration. But the inference is highly credible. On any reasonable conception of the supernatural it never was and never could be within the system of nature. Whatever the supernatural may be, it is from beyond nature, and whatever effects it may have upon the natural order will be by projection or pervasion. And here, within the framework of nature, are certain inextricable effects—life, motion, religion—of the origins of which nature can give no account. The inference of an effective supernatural adequate to account for life, motion and religion, is the inference which does least violence to reason. To conduct one's life upon a belief in some specially conceived character in that supernatural may be an adventure of faith; but to infer the supernatural is not an adventure of faith; it is a recognition of the claims of intelligence.

Luther and Calvin: A Contrast in Politics

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON

WHEN a nation like Germany shatters the peace of the world by launching a program of wide conquest, the underlying causes become a subject of study. They are found generally in such items as resentment at the peace conditions imposed in 1918, economic security, nationalistic ambition, racial consciousness, all bound together in the blind, crazy stubbornness of a leader whose unkept promises bestrew the battlefield of his twenty-year "Kampf," like piles of decaying corpses. But holy wars are no longer in style, and few think of religion as having anything to do with it.

Large sections of the Christian Church have ardently sought and preached peace during the last two decades. But while the Church in America and England has been breeding pacifists, the Church in Germany, generally speaking, has stood by and watched Hitler take its youth and has raised its hand in a loyal *Heil*; it has seen government agents censoring its pulpit utterances and has bowed its head in meek compliance; it has felt the pressure of totalitarianism dictating policies and bending theology to suit a fanatical anti-Judaism and has taken it all in meek subordination.

These developments indicate that Germany does not have what is known to Anglo-Saxons as a free Church. The present European conflict is often thought of as a warfare of ideologies, a political conflict—totalitarianism against democracy. But in the background of political differences is a contrast in religious thought. The long shadows of Martin Luther and John Calvin are to be seen in the present antagonism. Not that this is in any sense a holy war between the two, but the varying political attitudes of these two reformers are more a part of the total picture than is generally supposed. The political attitude of a religious leader can be handed down to successive generations of his followers along with his religious tenets, and can have a determining influence upon their relationship to the State. Implicit in the present prevailing attitude of Germans toward the German State is the political philosophy of Luther as expressed by himself and developed by his followers, while in

the free churches of Great Britain and our own country especially, we find a Calvinistic insistence that the worship of God is above nationalism and that the State must measure up to certain standards of righteousness if it is to claim the support of the deeply religious. It is this which makes religion a vital part of the war picture.

It is not held that German Christians were guilty of promoting war, but that their subservience to the State has relieved the State of any large religious interference in the developments that have led up to the war. In part, this is running true to Luther; in part, it is not. Actually, Luther was far more a believer in democracy and freedom than was Calvin. And yet, by a strange series of unpredictable developments, the influences emanating from the two men with respect to freedom are the opposites of what might be expected from a study of their differing political philosophies.

A look back through the centuries is necessary. The history of the world offers few more amazing stories than the growth of the Church from a pitiable condition of persecuted weakness in the first centuries, to a high pinnacle of power as ruler of princes and kings in the Middle Ages. The fact that the degree of its power varied inversely with its fitness to exercise the power probably requires little explanation. The fully developed Church, possessing unlimited authority, offered to ambitious youth a position of power, the possibility of wealth, and freedom from the discipline of the civil law which restrained ordinary human beings. These inducements naturally attracted some of the unscrupulous into the priesthood. The inevitable result was the Church's wide departure from the lofty ideals of the primitive centuries.

Good men can sometimes be responsible for great evils, as their successors warp the true meaning of their teaching to unworthy ends. So Ignatius Loyola, with his idea of perfect obedience; so Augustine, with his exalted theory of the city of God. Augustine led the Roman Church into a philosophy of State that resulted in the long struggle for temporal power between popes on one hand, and emperors on the other. The former won. The classic statement of the ecclesiastical attitude was formulated by Boniface VIII, whereby two swords were symbolic of the two great powers of the world, temporal and spiritual. The former, subject to the latter, meant that the State was properly subordinate to the Church. For centuries the Church, operating on this theory, had used the State as an agency for enforcing its dictates. Kings and emperors looked to the Church for authority to rule, and a determined Pope could keep a penitent emperor waiting barefoot in

the snows of winter for three days until ready to give him audience. Individual freedom was crushed between the two millstones.

In a world so completely controlled, any new movement, to become established, first had to provide for the possibility of difference. Men at that time were told what to think. Anyone bold enough to hold convictions of his own about religion, science, or politics, had to bear the consequences, which were heavy. The right of individual judgment had to be established against the strongest institution in the world. This was the task faced in the Reformation. Wyclif escaped martyrdom, though he had to pay the price for his heresies in comfort, position, and the esteem of influential contemporaries. His disciple, John Huss, went to the stake for daring to differ; and the same Council which condemned him dramatized its scorn of Wyclif by ordering his bones dug up and scattered to the four winds. It was another assertion of the Church's custody over the minds and consciences of the men of the fifteenth century.

But the days of such power were numbered. The seeds of truth had been planted, were slowly germinating, and were destined to break through the encrusted soil which temporarily held them suppressed. A ruthless Church with full mastery over the destinies of men could try Huss for his Wyclifism, find him guilty and excommunicate him. It could thus ban him from the fellowship of civilized people, could withdraw from him the hospitality of men, even the food and shelter necessary for life. It could put upon the city which gave him harbor an interdict that closed the gates of heaven to all citizens. It could break its promise of protection to Huss, tie him to the stake and burn him for his fancied sins. And most of the world would acclaim, because a heretic had no rights.

This was in 1415. A century later other developments had taken place which caused the challenge of Wyclif and Huss, reappearing in Luther, to be less easily dealt with. The old order was breaking up and giving place to something new. When Martin Luther in 1517 found himself plunged into unexpected prominence as a rebel against papal authority through the posting of his theses on the door of Castle Church, Wittenberg, this ecclesiastical autocracy was tottering to a fall. A new spirit of nationalism was manifesting itself. Political rulers were showing a disposition to challenge the supreme papal authority to which their predecessors had bent the knee.

While the Reformation was primarily a religious movement, the tremendous political power of the Church necessarily gave political theory and

activity a large place in the whole situation. A religious reformation to become permanent had to establish itself in a political world. The activities of emperor, kings and princes had a determining rôle in the final result of the Reformation, and the leader of the movement not only had to formulate his religious ideas to combat the theology of the Church which for a thousand years had had the monopoly of salvation; he was also forced to develop a policy regarding political matters, with which to steer successfully through the shifting stream of events.

It was natural that Luther should use allies wherever he could find them. Had it not been that a friendly elector gave him protection, the same fate that was meted out to Huss would probably have been his, and the Reformation would have had to wait for another period of time. It so happened, however, that this elector, Frederick of Saxony, wielded a power, as one of seven who was to determine the identity of the new head of the Holy Roman Empire. The Church preferred Francis I of France, over Charles V of Spain, for this office, and desiring to curry favor with one who might throw his influence toward Francis, it gave Frederick ear when he made intercession for Luther. The rebellious monk was thus spared a trip to Rome, which would probably have meant his early death.

Under these circumstances, it is not strange that Luther's political theories should be friendly to the State. Fighting a lone hand meant defeat and death for him. The only power which offered itself to help him cope with a puissant Church was that of political leaders within his native country of Germany. Many of these minor potentates found in the Church a rival not only in power but wealth. The money of the faithful went in a constant stream to Rome, which had its influence in impoverishing their state treasuries. Therefore, when someone appeared who was willing, for religious purposes, to challenge the Pope, they were not unready to ride along with his challenge as long as they could do so in safety. It was in the midst of such conditions that Luther's political theories were worked out.

Luther believed that the State was necessary to men, that it was an agent of God, divine in its function. The Bible was his authority in combating the religion of the Roman Church. It was natural that he should turn to the same source for guidance in formulating his political campaign against it. Here he discovered abundant evidence for the divine nature of government. He quotes time and again Paul's words in Romans 13, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers

that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." Picture a man, hounded by a hostile Church, finding refuge with the State, and discovering in his highest authority sentiments like the foregoing, and it is easy to see how his political theories gained almost a religious fervor. Following this and other Biblical injunctions, he arrived at a position which claimed for the Church only a spiritual authority, and turned over to the State the complete control of temporal affairs.

According to his theories, the State is to be sovereign over its citizens, churched or unchurched, orthodox and heretic alike. Outside interference is not to be tolerated—this, of course, referring particularly to the Pope. Through his appeal to the German nobility in 1520 Luther helped to break the temporal power of Rome and to set up a new German power in its stead. This he did with the full support of his religious fervor. As the northern part of Germany rallied rapidly to his banner, he became an exponent of a united Germany, which should be free to govern itself without interference from outside. According to his theories, this German national power was not to be held irresponsibly, nor was it to be unrestricted. The true function of government was to give to its citizens protection and peace, to educate its people in secular and religious learning, to care for the poor and to provide for all liberty of conscience, speech and press.

Luther believed in liberty. In his discussion on Christian Liberty, 1520, he took the paradoxical position that (1) a Christian man is the most free lord of all and subject to none; (2) a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to every one. The freedom was largely to be exercised against Rome, which robbed the German of his liberty; the dutifulness was to be exercised toward the State which secured his liberty. These ideas come from Luther's earlier works. The rise of radicalism, religiously among the Zwinglians and Anabaptists, and economically among the peasants, led him to modify his ideas after 1525, but McGiffert says "as long as he lived, Luther avowed himself in favor of full liberty of conscience."

The State to him was thus limited by the freedom which it should assure to its individual citizens. It was also limited by its responsibility to God. The citizen's first duty, he held, is to God, and he has the privilege of rebellion if the State gives him orders contrary to the laws of God. But by an unfortunate inconsistency he also held that princes, even though fools or scoundrels, are to be followed as long as they can be tolerated. Tyranny should be endured

for God's sake, for the ruler is God's representative. He even went so far as to say in his *Appeal to the German Nobility*, "I will side always with him, however unjust, who endures rebellion, and against him who rebels, however justly."

When it came to freedom of conscience Luther was probably the most tolerant of the reformers. He put to death no one for disagreeing with him; spoke of heresy as a "spiritual thing" which could not "be slain with the sword, burned with fire, or drowned with water"; held that "over the soul, God can and will let no one rule except Himself alone." Nevertheless, he grew more and more impatient of difference and never would join forces with those not of the same mind. In 1529, when the Landgrave of Hesse tried to unite Lutherans and Zwinglians by holding a conference between their leaders, on fourteen of fifteen points they were in agreement. On the matter of consubstantiation there was variation. To Luther this difference was an insuperable obstacle to co-operation, and though Zwingli was quite ready to join forces with him, the colloquy broke up, leaving the two men and their followers to go their separate ways. It is this trait of intolerance, characteristic of the age, that causes Bury to say, "It is an elementary error, but one which is still shared by many people who have read history superficially, that the Reformation established religious liberty and the right of private judgment. What it did was to bring about a new set of political and social conditions, under which religious liberty could ultimately be secured, and by virtue of its inherent inconsistencies, to lead to results at which its leaders would have shuddered."

Nevertheless, Luther's conviction regarding freedom was the dynamite which he planted under the wall of authority obstructing the road to the modern day. He tamped it down with the political power of princes and set it off with the fire of his indomitable courage. He thus broke the great power of Rome, without which achievement freedom could never have been given to men. In doing this he gave the right of private judgment at least some little footing in a hostile world. If he was not a modern in the matter of toleration, he cannot be too harshly blamed; he went farther along that path than the age in which he lived called for, and in that respect should have our admiration.

Calvin's political philosophy was worked out under quite different circumstances. Brought up in the Roman Church, as Luther had been, he broke with it after pursuing a combined legal and theological course. He was a

second-generation Protestant, and when his change of faith necessitated flight for safety, he had a refuge to which to repair, thanks in part at least to the labors of his predecessor. Basle opened its doors to him, as did Strassburg, and after he had distinguished himself by the writing of the first edition of his *Institutes*, while still in his middle twenties, Farel prevailed on him to come to the free town of Geneva. Here Calvin preached, but was not satisfied with the mere proclamation of the gospel. Shortly after his arrival, the Catholics having been bested and driven out (for in those days in many cities there was not room for more than one kind of Christian), a set of rules was drawn up for the regulation of the lives of the citizens. Calvin's political philosophy was tied up closely with his ascetic interpretation of religion. He had a very definite idea of the conduct requirements of the Christian life, and believed that the State's function was to enforce a rigid code of ethics upon its citizenship. Life was to be very simple—no expensive pleasures, no luxurious apparel, no fancy diet. Police were ordered to visit the homes of the city on regular inspection tours. They made minute examination of the private lives of all citizens—their reading, their bedtime, their attendance upon worship, their ideas. Infringements of the law were severely dealt with, anything up to death being used to give lessons in Christian conduct to the wayward populace.

Calvin distrusted people to be good without such regulation. He disbelieved in freedom as truly as did Rome. He was made ill when anyone disagreed with him, at times became hysterical, and called his opponents names such as "hissing serpents, barking dogs, Satan's spawn." He took a dislike to Castellio, the advocate of tolerance, who might have become a valued follower, and hounded him to death. He connived in the murder of Servetus because of a difference in doctrine, and allowed him to be slowly roasted. His victim screamed in agony at the stake for thirty minutes while Calvin pursued his studies in his own home.

Despite these differences in interpretation, Luther being by all odds the believer in freedom, Calvin the believer in strict intolerance, by a strange paradox of fate it happens that the succession of Calvin has been the agency for producing freedom of worship in the world, while the areas in which Luther's influence has been supreme have been devoid of a free Church.

That this could not possibly be due to the direct influence of the political ideas of the two men is apparent. It is doubtful, also, to what extent the theologies of the two leaders figured in this development. In general, it is

largely due to the accidents of history, and in two respects: First, the varying degree of difficulty in adjusting to civil government encountered by the two movements; second, the reactions of the two leaders' respective followers to the political problems they faced.

Luther's adjustment to government was comparatively easy, and therein lay the failure of his followers to develop a resistance which might be counted on in times like 1914 and 1939. As has been said, Luther, in his early struggles, found refuge from the power of Rome with the Elector of Saxony. He found ready support for his separatist adventure with the rulers of small principalities who were jealous of the power and wealth of Rome. It was natural for him to trust these rulers, playing into their hands as the lesser of two evils, surrendering any claim to temporal control, contenting himself with being a spiritual leader and leaving matters of government to them.

In his subsequent activities, after it was apparent that the break-up which he produced was not going to stop with him, but would be carried farther by more radical elements, he again found his refuge among these same rulers. They were the bulwarks of conservatism that offered him support in the later problem of combating religious and political radicalism. In a time when the religion of the people was determined by the attitude of their rulers, Luther found enough of the princes favorable to Protestantism to make him trust them as men of good judgment. So he accepted state support for his Church and developed a hands-off-of-government policy that set the State free from any threat of ecclesiastical interference, which was good, but also from danger of much moral suasion, which was not so good. He was a patriotic German, believed in the use of the sword when necessary, held to the right of the nation to control its own destiny, believed in a larger German unity.

It is a glaring weakness in his own system of thought that he provided his Church with so little background of resistance to the kind of conditions under which it is living today. This weakness would seem to be attributable to lack of foresight rather than of desire. When Luther lived, the great threat to religious liberty came not from the State, but from the Church. The State was the good friend of dissent and offered a safe harbor in which Luther felt quite at home. Most men meet only the problems which confront them, not the ones which are out of sight around the corner. The adjustment of his Church to the German State was so natural and easy that there was no reason for him to distrust the State. Nationalism had not at that time devel-

oped to be an enemy to human freedom and safety. The State, it is true, was using Luther's Protestantism to free itself from the dominance of Rome, but it made little attempt to dictate ecclesiastical theology or polity. Today, with the rise of totalitarianism in Germany, the State again wants to use religion for its own ends, but can do so only by warping it out of its Christian forms to fit the ideology of "Mächt-Politik." That this friendly State of Luther's day should thus eventually become the arch enemy of the faith was one of the tricks of history for which Luther was not responsible, but for which he will, to some extent, have to take the blame. His subservience to princes was a bit too naïve and docile. A man who could thunder his challenges at entrenched Catholicism would have been far greater in his influence upon the world's development if he had maintained more independence for his Protestantism in those areas where political leaders were concerned. Such an attitude on his part might conceivably have saved his Church from the pitiable plight in which it finds itself today.

The successors of Luther largely followed the path which he pointed out for them. In general, his word has been their rule, from Melanchthon down to the present, with some notable exceptions. The political philosophy of the Church has been to keep hands off temporal matters, to work within the nation for the individual salvation of its people, and to become the uncritical handmaiden of the State in its political exploits. Had the Germany of the past quarter century had working within it some of the powerful political ideas that emanated from Geneva, the recent history of the world might possibly have been different, and happier.

As has been pointed out, Calvin brought back into the Reformed Church a definite relationship between Church and State. His attitude was akin to the old Roman Catholic idea that the State should be the instrument for the carrying out of religion's requirements—but with one very important difference. To the Catholic, such state assistance was largely brought into action for promoting the institutional welfare and prosperity of the Church. Calvin used it not for institutional or temporal purposes, but for ethical considerations. He definitely believed that it was the business of the Church to see that the State and its people conformed to religious standards, and he spent a good portion of his life in the accomplishment of this end in the city of his residence.

It was not strange, therefore, that his disciples took this same ideal and applied it in their political theory and activities in their own countries. Had

these followers of Calvin found themselves easily at home in friendly governments, as did Luther, there would have been no resistance upon which to sharpen the political ideas which finally secured for Protestants religious freedom from an unwilling world. The resistance itself was a friend to Calvin in causing this extreme autocrat to become one of the founders of freedom; the comparative freedom of the German states, while more comfortable at the time, was the snare that detracts most largely from Luther's fame today.

Calvinism spread to Holland, where it had to win its right to existence by defying the predatory power of Spain. The story is exhaustively told in Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, which makes clear the large place which the tenacious Protestantism of Calvin had in throwing off the yoke of Spain, in establishing its own autonomy, in making Holland a refuge for rebels and liberty lovers, which it still remains today.

John Knox carried on a successful warfare in Scotland. Praying, "Give me Scotland or I die," he defied Queen Mary Stuart's regime, and fought for the right to be Protestant until he won it for his people to the end of time. A similar struggle was carried on in the southern end of the British island, where the established Church, but for the influence of those who had been consumed by the Geneva spirit, would have been little more than Catholicism without a Pope. It is true that the British king still remains the head of the Church and the defender of the faith, but woe betide any monarch who tries to dictate to his people the manner in which they may worship God. Their freedom in this respect was won by a long struggle in which Calvin's followers, including one Oliver Cromwell, were the liberating agency.

The fight spread to America, which was founded on the right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience, with limitations, it must be acknowledged. The narrowness of the Puritans is admitted, but it should never be asserted without a prayer of thanksgiving for the heroism of those who loved God ardently enough to surrender their comfort and risk their lives for the freedom of their consciences.

The claim of religious freedom against governmental interference has evidenced itself in more modern times. A student of Middle Europe cites a recent instance. When Francis Joseph, the Catholic Emperor of Austria-Hungary, threatened Protestant autonomy by attempting to interfere in the synods of the Reformed Church, a pastor with the blood of Knox running through his veins said: "The Austrian dynasty has not received any right from God or from men by which it may intermeddle in the government of the

Reformed Church." It is religion's militant demand for freedom rousing itself to action again.

But the survey of the contrasting political philosophies of Luther and Calvin requires us today to give admiring attention to such men as Martin Niemoeller. His leadership among a band of conscientious objectors against the claims of totalitarianism has won widespread notice and sympathetic admiration among Christians around the world in the years of the Hitler regime. Albert Einstein, commenting on this resistance to totalitarianism, remarked that he felt a great affection and admiration for the Church because it alone had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom, against a regime of suppression.

In the light of this resistance, the case against Luther's political philosophy would seem to crumble. Three considerations may be advanced to support the thesis of this paper. In the first place, the resisting wing, represented by Niemoeller, was always a small minority. The average Lutheran minister in Germany has taken his orders and has stood openly behind his Fuehrer. He has conceded that the powers of government are ordained of God, as Luther did in his day. Second, it is quite possible that Calvin has had something to do with the appearance of this admirable group of martyrs in the so-called Confessional Church, who are repeating the sacrifices of the primitive Church. At least, Karl Barth, one of the prominent resisters, now an exile, is an expounder of neo-Calvinism, belonged to the Reformed wing of the State Church, and is far closer to Geneva than to Wittenberg in his theology. But third, when the war broke out the limits of the Niemoeller revolt appeared very clearly. According to unimpeachable evidence, Niemoeller, in concentration camp at the war's outbreak, as a veteran U-boat commander quickly offered his services again. His revolt had been narrowly ecclesiastical, or, as many think, from Hohenzollern sympathies, or both. But it had not been due to a Christian criticism of what outsiders think of as a non-Christian political regime, or it would have been as stoutly maintained after September first as before. This means that even in the Confessional Church the old subservience to the State, characteristic of Lutheranism, is running true to form.

We had reason to hope that Niemoeller would lead the Church of Luther into a new emancipation movement; that the rigid molds of totalitarianism and the conflict into which it had plunged a long-suffering German people would furnish to this generation of Lutherans the same kind of

resistance upon which to sharpen a political philosophy of free religion that Calvinists profited by two and three centuries ago. There is ample love of freedom in the teaching of Luther to give vital support to such a movement. His followers owe it to his free spirit to rescue it from its unholy entanglements. In the words of Bishop Arthur J. Moore, at the Uniting Conference of Methodism, "The time has come for the Church to decide whether it is going to be the bride of Christ or the mistress of the State." Were Luther to return, is it not possible that the same holy indignation with which he resisted the power of papal ecclesiasticism would be exercised against the claims of a totalitarian State today? In his day he made alliance with the State for the cause of freedom and truth; today his love for truth and freedom might well lead him to fight their enemies wherever he found them.

In some respects history has been kinder to Calvin than to Luther. The former's five points of theology are largely gone. Limited atonement, pre-destinate election, and other such impossible theological interpretations are seldom heard from the pulpits of the twentieth century. In breaking the domination of the State over religion, these ideas imposed upon men another slavery, emancipation from which has been won by equally brave spirits who resisted Calvin as he resisted kings. The struggle of the world to emancipate itself from the unchristian influence of his theology forms another story less creditable to the Emperor of Geneva. But meanwhile the paradoxical influence of this same iron-willed tyrant, who never believed in democracy or practiced it, has been working for the establishment of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience.

The followers of Calvin have enabled him to go marching along with the free and democratic modern age as if he belonged there. It lies with the followers of Luther to determine whether an unpredictable trick of history is forever going to rob him of his proper place as one of the world's great emancipators. If they refuse, the future lies with Calvin, if the future is to be durable for free men.

A Mirror for Preachers

JOHN PATERSON

THE Hebrew prophets have been interpreted in various ways, but the most adequate interpretation is that which views them as preachers who spoke to the people of their time. Their validity for us is constituted by the fact that while their message has a transient and temporary setting it enshrines permanently valid spiritual principles. We may neglect the setting but we may not neglect the spiritual truth revealed by the setting.

The word "prophet" is frequently understood in the sense of one who speaks beforehand and foretells the future, and it would be correct to say that every great prophet in the Old Testament does foretell in this sense. But a glance at a dictionary will show that the word is derived from the Greek "pro," meaning "on behalf of," and "phemi," meaning "I speak." Thus the prophets are "spokesmen for God," and, like the modern preacher, their immediate business is to make God visible, to reveal His character and His purpose and to make plain the whole duty of man. In that sense they are a "mirror for preachers."

As to how these men became preachers they themselves leave us in no doubt. They will not have their motives impugned and therefore in each instance they tell us how they became preachers and spokesmen for God. They are in this business because they cannot keep out; they had no option. They knew, as we know, that men enter the ministry who should not, that there are those who "run but have not been sent." But they know themselves to be sent of God; they are "apostles" in the true sense of that term. It may not be customary in our day to investigate the motives of men entering the ministry, but the present writer was examined on the very threshold of his career as a theological student as to "piety and motive." It may be that many today would resent such a scrutiny and maintain the Bill of Rights against it! But if it is not done by others it should at least be done by ourselves. No man can be happy in the Christian ministry unless he bears the commission and seal of the Great King. "There was a man *sent of God* whose name was John;" herein lies the preacher's Magna Charta.

It will reward us to contemplate these prophetic preachers and mark some characteristic features of their preaching. In the first place they were

speakers and not writers. That may seem a rather elementary point to make, but it affords food for thought. We read the prophets and we invite our people to read them with us and the whole thing is so quiet and orderly that we miss the original setting. The Hebrew word that is used of the preacher speaking means "to cry aloud," and sometimes it is strengthened by an addition and we get "to cry with the throat." Sir George Adam Smith informs us that "the dry climate and large leisure of the East bestow on the lower chords of the voice a greater depth and suppleness," and certainly there was nothing of the "sotto voce" but much of the "basso profundo" in the prophetic utterance. When those preachers spoke no one complained of not hearing; they could coo like doves but normally they bellowed like bulls. "Hear, O Heavens, and give ear, O Earth" (Isaiah 1. 2) was a frequent exordium, and the hills re-echoed with the sound (Micah 6. 1). In the still Eastern atmosphere the voice would carry far and the preacher made sure it did; they were ideal preachers in the open air, and required no megaphone. When Elijah met Ahab and when Isaiah went down to the waterworks to talk to Ahaz neither of these preachers spoke in whispers, though the kings wished they did. With a Stentor's voice they said what they had to say and the crowd was soon there or could hear it all in the distance. The prophets of Baal "cried aloud" and Elijah encouraged them to cry louder still. Not that it is to be inferred that we will be heard for our "much speaking" or loud speaking, but it is eminently desirable that a preacher should be heard. It is worthy of note that the evangelists report of Jesus that when He set Himself to preach "he lifted up his eyes and opened his mouth" (Matthew 5. 2; Luke 6. 20). The first business of the preacher is to "speak up."

The prophets knew the danger that lurks here. For the preacher may be only a voice, *vox et praeterea nihil*. A voice is the first requisite in the preacher, but it is not the only requisite; where it is so regarded something tragic emerges and we can well understand the experience of Ezekiel, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice." There is always the danger, the subtle danger, that public worship may descend to the level of popular entertainment and the preacher be regarded as a crooner. And the man in the street will say "religion is dope," and he may not be so far astray, for when the person of the preacher obscures the winsomeness of Jesus, preaching has missed its mark. Here the corrective is found in the prophets themselves; all through their preaching, with certain necessary exceptions, the person of the preacher recedes entirely behind his message

and the God for whom he speaks. Some of them are cloaked with anonymity, but their names are written in His "book of remembrance."

This vigor of speech was accompanied with an extraordinary amount of gesture and gesticulation. The place of gesture in preaching is frequently a problem, and if one may make a general statement here it would be to the effect that all gestures should be spontaneous and free. It is related of Principal Marcus Dods, who came within an ace of being a "stickit minister," that after six years' vain search for a congregation to call him as pastor he sought advice from a more successful friend. Dods was lifeless in his preaching and totally devoid of animation; he was just as hopeless as could be. The friend suggested that Dods should display some signs of being really alive and, to this end, use an occasional gesture. Dods resolved to try it and at his next preaching he lifted his hand in what was intended to be a gesture, but, unfortunately, forgot to restore it to its natural position, and the last state of Dods was worse than the first! Gestures, of course, come easier to Southern Europeans and Orientals, and the Old Testament preacher can teach us here. Some of those gestures are passing strange; a minister with a whirling sword in his hand (*Ezekiel 21. 11*) or a cattle yoke on his neck would at least cause a modern congregation to sit up and take notice. Spurgeon enriched our homiletical literature by a charming little volume on *Eccentric Preachers*, but the extraordinary men he portrayed would find difficulty in getting located today; so of course might Jeremiah and Ezekiel! Nevertheless we might reach people through the eyegate when we fail to enter by the ear-gate. Certainly, under such preachers, one would have little opportunity of making up lost sleep; the old-time Boanerges gave his hearers something to think about.

Few modern preachers stand the test of cold print. Sermons that moved us when heard seem frozen stiff when read. There are exceptions to this rule—Phillips Brooks, F. W. Robertson, and G. H. Morrison are such—but the exceptions only prove the rule. But there is something distinct about those prophetic preachers and a degree of liveliness in their sermons which no lapse of time can kill. "Style is the man," and here we have a peculiarly animated style. The words live "and walk up and down in our hearts." For there is a radiant certainty here that overpowers us; like the *Ancient Mariner*, they hold us rooted to the spot. John Morley (Viscount Blackburn), although he was an agnostic, was once asked why he attended the services of Alexander MacLaren of Manchester. "You don't believe what he says," said the inquirer,

to which Morley replied, "No, but he does." We all want to be sure that the preacher really believes; he must give us the impression of authenticity. That element confers vitality on his speech. These preachers were "men of the secret"; they had stood in the counsel of Yahwe and seen to the roots and realities of things. Their insights, in most cases, were partial and broken; human speech might be too frail to bear the weight of their vision, but they were at least convincing. We err when we try to systematize their preaching and produce a system of theology; we err, for the connection in the prophetic preaching is *not logical but optical*. They think "with the eye," and there is a rapidity and unexpectedness in the thought as it leaps from one aspect of truth to another; something catches the preacher's eye and he is off on a new tack. It may give a certain sense of incoherence which our logic avoids, but it impresses with a real sense of liveliness. "The lively oracles of God" is how a New Testament writer describes the result.

It would not be easy for a modern to catch this style, for it would certainly infringe most canons of sermon construction. Certain methods of modern preaching are not so far removed from it, and the disappearance of the old-fashioned exordium enables us at times to plunge *in medias res*. What could be more arresting than this from Jeremiah for an opening?

"O that my head were waters,
And my eyes a fountain of tears;
That day and night I might lament
The slain of my people." (Jeremiah 9. 1.)

Or could one make a more startling opening than this from Hosea?

"Sound the trumpet at Gibeah,
Proclaim it at Ramah:
Make loud the alarm in Bethel;
Set Benjamin a-fright." (Hosea 5. 8.)

Or could one make a more promising opening than this from Deutero-Isaiah?

"Get thee up to a high mountain,
O herald of joy for Zion!
Lift up thy voice with might,
Jerusalem's glad news-bringer." (Isaiah 40. 9.)

These old preachers knew well how to begin by arresting attention; they knew, too, how to hold attention. It is wise for a preacher to make his first sentence arresting; we must catch the hearer ere he has time to fall on sleep. The prophets are competent teachers here. Look at Isaiah dissembling himself

as a troubadour and singing the song of the vineyard; look at those people who gather round this strange sight. Mark how he keeps them "in the air" right to the end and mark too how he brings them down to solid earth with his crashing close:

"For Yahwe's vineyard is the house of Israel,
The men of Judah His darling plantation;
For order He looked—but, lo, disorder!
For right—but, lo, riot!"

That comes with all the force of a knockout straight from the shoulder. Isaiah knew "how to get his man." Amos may be a rustic hind, but he knows the secret of effective preaching. If Julian Morgenstern is correct in his description of Amos' ministry, it was all over in twenty minutes on the New Year's morning of 751 B. C. In the dim morning twilight the prophet winds along the way to the sanctuary where the greatest service of the year is about to begin. As he chants in monotone the fall of Israel's neighbors the hearts of the chosen people must have responded with a grand Amen. But as he reaches the Eastern door—opened only on the equinoctial days—the voice rises clearer in the death song of Israel:

"Fallen is the Virgin Israel;
To rise no more;
Prostrate she lies on the ground,
None to upraise her" (Amos 5. 2).

A deathly chill must have come over the hearts of all as they heard that funeral chant on the New Year's morn. Amos may have known nothing of the homiletic axiom, "Begin low, go slow, catch fire, rise higher, sit down in a storm," but assuredly no past master in the art of preaching could arrange his material more effectively. Seldom have twenty minutes been used to such purpose.

Another element in the prophetic preaching follows from this. We refer to their ability to stir uneasiness and provoke thought. In a sense that is argument by suggestion, though not in the usual sense of that phrase. We mean their use of words that "half conceal and half reveal," words which leave the hearer wondering what it really means. All good preaching will refrain from making everything clear so that the hearer can say, "Well, that's that," and go on his way as if nothing had transpired. Preaching should have a barb in it, and the prophetic preaching was amply barbed. What did Jeremiah mean by his "people from the North"? and what did Amos mean by that

refrain, "I will not turn it back," and what did Jesus mean by "this night *they* are asking back thy soul"? They knew well how to bring the pressure of "the weird" upon the spirits of the unheeding. The sermon might be only twenty minutes long, but it was not over and done with then; people could not sleep, because these words were ringing and stinging in their minds. What did he mean? When people come around to you in the vestry or call you up in the night, you may get down on your knees and thank God that you have graduated to the goodly fellowship of the prophets and have learned something of their secret. We can be too clear in our preaching, and we can miss those after-meetings with the disciples which both they and Jesus loved. "Let him that readeth understand."

Furthermore, it is characteristic of the prophets that they are extraordinarily concrete. After all, it is difficult to "cordialize with an *ens rationis*." Thus they came down from the skies and tread the solid earth; their speech smacks of the soil. Brevity of time is "the years of an hireling," and if an infinitesimal remnant will survive "it shall be as the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of an ear," or it shall be as the harvest of the gleaner who cleans up after the reaper, "as the shaking of an olive tree, two or three berries in the top of the outermost bough, four or five in the outermost fruitful branches thereof" (Isaiah 17. 4-6). Such concrete realism is not found in modern preachers, but A. J. Gossip comes very close to it; Alexander Whyte has it in his character studies, and J. D. Jones owes much of his power to this characteristic. Whyte's famous sermon on the "Rich Young Ruler" may well be compared, for sheer, stark realism, with the arrival of the Babylonian king in Sheol (Isaiah 14. 9f.).

But no mark is so clear as their uncommon weight of passion. The prophets never stand outside to discuss dispassionately. Their words live and their thought burns; they are men inspired. Preaching like that left the hearers awe-struck (Amos, Jonah), or it moved to an overwhelming passion of anger so that the preacher was in danger of his life (Jeremiah 7). Most of us would be unable to handle such a situation; a brawl in the sanctuary is an awkward matter. It may be difficult for us to show such passion or awaken it in our hearers, for Greek moderation controls our thought; our very skin has turned to parchment and our blood to scrivener's ink. The word does not "run" nor is it mighty in our hands "to the pulling down of strongholds"; our word moves in stately fashion—if it moves at all. We are afraid of emotion, but the prophets never hesitate in such appeal. They live and move

and have their being in emotion—Hebrew speech has no word for brain. With a strange fury they contend for God till both preachers and hearers are fused to white heat; hard hearts are melted and “tough souls” are made tender by such cleansing discipline. We are inhibited here by the “proprieties,” and the Greek with his “nothing too much” proves our undoing. There is no limit to the intensity of these “spokesmen for God”; no image is too grim or gruesome for their use. The slain lie “like dung on the ground” (Jeremiah 8. 2); “they stumble on corpses” (Nahum 3. 3); infants are “dashed in pieces,” women with child are “ripped up” (Amos 1. 13).

“Instead of perfume shall be rottenness;
 Instead of a girdle, a rope;
 Instead of artful curls, baldness;
 Instead of festal robe, sackcloth;
 Branding instead of beauty.” (Isaiah 3. 24.)

Pictures like these impressed themselves indelibly on the mind of the hearer and shook them in the depths of their being. Nor were they less skilled in the way of promise and hope. Their words here ring like iron and shine like cloth of gold.

“And the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun,
 And the light of the sun shall be sevenfold,
 In the day that Yahwe upbinds the breach of his people,
 And heals their sore wound” (Isaiah 30. 26); compare Isaiah 11. 6-9.

We sometimes think of those preachers as statesmen, but this exceeding weight of passion disqualifies them for that function; with the exception of Isaiah it is doubtful if we may apply the term to those preachers. The greasy arena of politics is not the most appropriate place for the man of God. Like Nehemiah the preacher may well say to those who would draw him aside to greater zeal in politics, “I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down” (Nehemiah 6. 3).

According to the Reformers, the notes of the true Church are (a) the preaching of the gospel, (b) the administration of the sacraments, (c) the maintenance of discipline. The first two notes we understand full well; the third note we must understand better. It is the business of the Church to maintain a level of conduct in its members below which they may not fall. The Church has a discipline, though it is not applied in thoroughgoing fashion. There are certain things Christian people have no right to do. The Pauline Epistles not only set forth a system of doctrine but they unfold also

a Christian ethic and that is where the third note is sounded. "But fornication and all uncleanness or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints." *Noblesse oblige*; the Christian owes something to the name he bears and to his Master. The same thought emerges in Nehemiah, "Should such a man as I flee?" (Nehemiah 6. 11.) There are certain things just impossible for Christians—if they are to remain Christians—and it is the business of the Christian preacher to see that people are kept up to the level of the high calling of God in Christ. For that reason the prophet regards himself as an "assayer" or "tester" (Jeremiah 6. 27), or as a "watchman" (Ezekiel 3. 17); he tests the "metal" of his people to guard against infusion of base alloy, he watches for their souls as one who must give account. His business is "to declare unto Jacob his transgression and to Israel his sin" (Micah 3. 8). Or, to put it in terms of the Reformers, his function is to maintain (if we may put it so) Christian conduct at the Christian level.

Now such a function is not as easy as it seems. The Church is set in the world, but its boundaries are not conterminous with the world. There are whole tracts of life and experience yet to be redeemed and brought within the sway of Jesus—of that the Church is painfully conscious at the present juncture. All things are not yet "put under His feet." We have only to think of the State to see what is involved. A State has to legislate for the masses, while the Church legislates for the "saints." Obviously the State cannot legislate ahead of public opinion and it must be content with what it can get. It is not a question of what one ought but of what one can. But the Church is wedded to the ideal and no counsels of expediency can enter here. Thus the Church must constantly challenge the State and set its ideal over against all "Realpolitik"; counsels of perfection must oppose counsels of expediency. The Church can allow no discount in the spiritual realm, and though the Christian State may take the Master's bills and where He writes a hundred the State may write eighty or even fifty, such practice cannot be permitted in the Christian Church if it means to be a New Testament Church. The Church must insist on the full Christian ethic and the function of the Church is so to discharge this duty that finally there will be no reason for the Church's continued existence, for the boundaries of State and Church will have become conterminous. There will be no need then of the Church or the preacher, for all will be Church; "I saw no temple therein."

In this sense, therefore, we venture to utter a paradox and say that the preacher's ability is to be measured by his *capacity to empty his church*. Amos

does not appear to have gathered a congregation, though he got an audience; his successors did not fare any better in the matter of a "charge," but most folk agreed they were great preachers and we agree with the verdict. The charlatans of that time seem to have had large followings, and that may still be true of their successors. When a man preaches the full Christian ethic and declares the whole counsel of God in its individual reference and its social ramifications, he is operating with something that is "sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Hebrews 4. 12). When a man refuses to allow people to become Christians on their own terms he is going to have trouble aplenty. People will transfer their membership to some place where their conscience may be drugged with less potent medicine and their wounds touched with less drastic surgery. The preacher may lose the applause of men, but he will be able to keep the peace with his own conscience and interview his own heart without fear. The people cannot be fooled all the time and eventually they come to know the difference between a pillar and a caterpillar. We can make our ministry like a perpendicular column that rises into the very heavens or we can make it a mean low thing that grovels in the dust and panders to the low desires of people and cries, "Peace, peace, where there is no peace" (Jeremiah 5. 31).

What a mirror for preachers we have here! There is Amos with his "Gospel of the lion's roar" (MacFadyen), a rough, brusque preacher who found many a likeminded preacher in the Church of Scotland, where aforetime they well knew how "to haud (hold) the sinner owre (over) the brimstone pit." Such preaching might often lack heart, and its preachers belonged to the Hard Church. But though Amos may terrify he does not satisfy. Yet there are elements in Amos which are sorely needed in present-day preaching; their presence would put blood and iron into our sermons and give our discourses teeth. So many have come to think of religion in a namby-pamby fashion that our preaching is like to become drenched with sentimentality and degenerate into "sob stuff." It is not required of us that when we put off the old man we should put on the old woman. Jesus knew well that wrath is the obverse of love, and where there is strength of love there will be strong hatred of that which injures love. "It were better for him that a millstone were tide about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea" (Matthew 18. 6). The wrath of God has ceased to be a "bogey" to us, but it is

a wrath none the less real, and we neglect this awful reality at our peril.

Hosea, on the other hand, comes close to us; he "speaks around our heart." The stern moralist gives place to the gentle evangelist; Law is supplemented by Grace. Amos saw only the broken tables of the Law, but Hosea gazed on the broken heart of God. Amos' view was external, but Hosea's from within; the natural world was Amos' instructor, but Hosea found a gospel hid in his suffering and his own tragic experience became the channel of divine revelation. *Pectus facit theologum*, the heart makes the theologian, and here we have a theology distilled from the agony of a suffering, broken heart. Hosea may have less breadth than Amos—he does not speak of peoples outside Israel—but he had depth and intensity greater far. He is saved from sentimentality through his maintenance of the stern moral emphases of his predecessor and Grace reigns in righteousness.

Isaiah is most regal of all the prophets; he is a nonesuch, "without a peer, himself his own parallel." For comprehensiveness of view, nobility of thought and lofty utterance he stands unique. Yet he is debtor to his predecessors and stands upon their shoulders. Righteousness and Grace are set forth here in all their majesty and tenderness, with the force of Amos and the passion of Hosea, but mercy triumphs over judgment and Grace is finally regnant and supreme. Isaiah declares the whole counsel of God and the partial views of his predecessors are unified in a developed system of doctrine.

But best of all as a mirror for preachers is the "impassioned man of Anathoth," whose Hosanna finally was reached "through great whirlwinds of doubt" (Dostoevsky). He is the last of the great prophets and after him could come only One who was greater than he. He is less than Isaiah because he is more human, but he is more intriguing as a personality; he is more like ourselves and his experience we can understand. Unlike those others who seemed to stand at the side of God and hurl His words toward the people, Jeremiah seems to stand between God and the people and gather to his own bosom the shafts of divine indignation. He "executeth the office of a prophet and a priest," and with a heart big as the world he agonizes for "my people" and all the children of men. His ministry is exercised with such passion and power that to this day he stands before us as the tender and invincible ambassador of the living God. Not without reason have men seen in that moving, mysterious picture of the Suffering Servant (Isaiah 52. 13-53. 12) the form of Jeremiah. His entrance upon his ministry is marked by all that humility that characterizes truly noble men in the face of great responsibility;

his humility is "the inverted image of his nobleness" (Carlyle). Called to scale heights where lesser men dared not follow and to endure utter loneliness in space and spirit, we marvel at his patience and his passion. There is none so fit for us to study and mark and inwardly digest if we would be prophetic preachers. Little wonder is it that when men saw Jesus and heard those words of grace and truth they were reminded of Jeremiah. Jesus, however, is not Jeremiah *redivivus* though He clasps hands with him across the centuries and takes up again the thought of a new Covenant which is for the remission of sins (Luke 22. 20). "After Jeremiah could come only One who was greater than he" (Cornill).

The goodly fellowship of the prophets is not yet closed. To assert that would be to deny the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit. But if we would join the ranks of "the glorious company of the apostles" it may be only as we catch the prophetic fire and enter their secret. They are a mirror for preachers.

Polity as a Bar to Church Union

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR.

IT IS strange that with all the attention which has been paid to differences in creed as separating the Christian brotherhood, comparatively little thought has been given to differences in polity as doing the same thing; and yet polity has played, and may continue to play, a very important part in perpetuating what the Prayer Book kindly terms our "unhappy divisions." The late Dr. Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, who gave much of his ministry to the cause of Church Union, once said to the writer that he believed that polity had more to do with keeping churches apart than have creeds; but Doctor Ainslie spoke casually, and I do not know how far he would have pressed this. Certainly, differences in church organization do mean far more than is apparent on the surface, and the ordinary church member is much more concerned over the way in which his church is "run" than he is over the exact number of Articles in its official creed—or, indeed, whether his church has a formal creed or not.

At any rate, it is evident that if the move toward Church Union is to be continued—as is the hope and wish of most Christians today—sooner or later this matter of polity for the Church—that-is-to-be will have to be faced. And it is almost as evident that not even the harmonizers of the creeds will have a heavier task handed them than will those who are to prescribe a form or organization for the universal Church on earth. For let it be clearly understood that even those who object to any outward form or definite organic framework for such a universal Church, are themselves supporting a polity very much in evidence now in certain of the branches of the Christian Church. In other words, those who say we need not pay any attention to polity, are decidedly supporting a polity of their own, whether they know it or not.

Reverting to the matter of creedal differences, it is perfectly possible, as everyone realizes, to draw up a creed that will affirm in sonorous unison the things upon which all can agree. It is even possible, paradoxically enough, to agree upon those things over which to disagree. Indeed, all the ecclesiastical conferences and ecumenical gatherings which have been held to date take as their starting point the basic items of faith to which all Chris-

tians subscribe and to which there can be no dissent. In so far as is possible, there is no mention of those things upon which all are not in agreement, and to that extent, in a definite and positive way, something like real unity can be found at a Lausanne, Jerusalem, Edinburgh, or Oxford Conference. No delegate ever—well, hardly ever!—mentions the things upon which he knows all other delegates will not be in accord. This is wise, and a prime example of that inclusiveness which is the true mark of catholicity.

But temporary conferences and conventions proclaiming enthusiastically that to which there can be no objection, are one phase of it; a formal organization, not only setting forth a creed but perpetuating its own life, is something else. If the goal of all this movement toward Church Union really be to build a permanent organization in this world into which the pooled might of existing ecclesiastical organizations—that is, churches—shall be so placed as to create a unified Church-on-earth, then this matter of polity comes at once to the fore. Shall there be, or should there be, a churchly organization on earth of a concrete sort, and if so, what form shall it take? Shall it be merely a nebulous agglomeration of organizations on a super-Federal Council pattern, with the power of advice and recommendation but nothing more? What, after all, is aimed at? What are the thinking Christians of the world envisioning as the body of the Church-to-be? Not the new Jerusalem of the skies, nor the mystic communion of the saints, but the all-inclusive corporate Church of God on earth?

A moment's consideration will show that the crux of this whole question will inhere in the control which the universal Church—if we may so call it—is to have over the local church, or over the individual Christian. There are certain denominations today which are rather centrally organized, and these may be taken to illustrate this control of the whole over the parts. There are certain other churches or denominations which are not centrally organized—anything but. Is ultimate catholicity to be found in the one form or the other—or is there a golden mean of churchly checks and balances somewhere in between? Certainly, there are some things which the individual Christian feels he cannot yield to any ecclesiastical control no matter how august; certainly there are some things which the universal Church cannot yield without imperiling its own life and mission. The situation that faces us here may be illustrated in a concrete way by viewing certain of the great denominations at present in existence in the Christian brotherhood.

The Roman Catholic Church is, of course, the prime example of ecclesiastical centralization. Her laws are inflexible; her rule over an individual, or an individual congregation, complete. She puts her services into one language and presses that language upon all her people wherever they live. A Roman Catholic priest in China baptizing a Chinese baby asks the questions in plain Latin even as did Ximenes in Toledo or Pere Marquette in the woods of the North. The Roman Catholic Church moves her priests, her bishops and archbishops when and where she pleases; she tells her people what to read and what not to read, what they may believe and what they may not believe; her councils declare her undivided mind and her Pope speaks for God.

As a recoil against this whole system, Protestantism exalts the individual, making his conscience, that is to say, his private judgment, the arbiter. As against any centralized earthly control, the right of private determination in all matters of religion is the very essence of Protestantism. Once that right be granted to men, we not only may expect, we must approve, the thousand and one divisions among them. This fact, of course, needs no explanation, though, strangely enough, it provides perennial amazement among Protestant church leaders. Over against the exclusiveness of Rome, the inclusiveness of Protestantism sets itself, hoping all things, believing all things, and enduring—well, a surprising amount.

But in Protestantism itself there are varying degrees of centralized control among its separate denominations. The Methodist Church, for instance, is a good example of an organization whose control over the local church is amazingly complete. Likewise the Protestant Episcopal Church, while it has not the control over the local church which Methodism has, holds to a theory of Episcopal prerogative in relation to church membership which makes the laying on of hands by a Bishop necessary before one can enter the pale of the Church. The Presbyterians occupy a middle ground, with their synods having a certain amount of control over the churches which compose those synods but leaving other matters entirely in the hands of the local congregation. But it is to the Baptist and the Congregational groups that we turn to see exemplified the absolutely independent spirit which is the complete out-flowering of the Protestant genius. The conventions of these denominations may suggest and recommend, may beg and implore, but they dare not command. Any movement or resolution that has about it the faintest suggestion of an encroachment upon the authority of the local congregation, at once

brings a shout, "To your tents, O Israel," among the Baptist hosts. The most popular measures proposed at the recent general Convention of the Southern Baptist Church were those aimed at totalitarianism in Church or State—and almost every delegate who went to Oklahoma City arrived there with a pocketful of resolutions aimed at these dangers.

Here, then, in this matter of centralization *versus* decentralization, there inheres a formidable obstacle to ultimate union—one not nearly as obvious as a proposed printed creed might be, but one which is deeply ingrained in the attitudes of the people of the separate groups. That this barrier or bar to union is concealed by the psychological nature of each one's religious background makes it all the more difficult. For—and this is the important fact—when the separate groups of Protestantism think of the ultimate unity of all Christian churches, *they invariably think of this in terms of the organization with which they are familiar.*

It never enters the head of a Baptist or a Congregationalist that his local church will one day go into an organization which will assign to it a preacher after the manner of the Methodist system. It scarcely enters the head of an Episcopalian that he will one day go into a system where people will be admitted to the Church by the instant vote of a congregation, as they are now admitted to the Congregational or Baptist churches. He, the Episcopalian, feels that the Church never has been constituted that way before, and that the sacred service of Confirmation at the hands of a Bishop is apt to be a much more safe and sure gate of admission into the Church than the rapid: "I move we receive the brother."

"Second the motion."

"All in favor say *aye*"—of the Baptist brotherhood.

And as far as the Methodists are concerned, the reason it has taken ninety-four years to get Southern and Northern Methodists together is because they have always thought in terms of a general Church which can and does put preachers into pulpits, with, theoretically, little or no advice from the local congregations. From the preachers' viewpoint, the matter is even more important. When a man sees his general Church as an organization that tells him what congregation he shall preach to, what house he shall live in, what his salary shall be, where his children shall be schooled, how long he shall preach, and what his retirement stipend shall be, he is apt to look a long time before he agrees to any change in an organization that is going to continue controlling him in so many sweeping ways. In fact, we

have heard Baptist and Presbyterian ministers who expressed admiration in many ways for the efficiency of the Methodist system, finally dismiss it all by saying: "But, it is a system I could never submit to. I don't see how they do it!"

At present these differences in polity are merely academic matters to be discussed with neighborly good will. But if the time ever comes when they are to be reduced to uniformity as part of the Constitution of the Church-to-be, they will surely provide a field for the most searching debate. Does any Baptist or Presbyterian—or for that matter, any Episcopalian—have any idea that the Unified Church of the future will select a minister for each local church as does the Methodist system? Is there any idea that the Conferences or Conventions of the Unified Church will be able to tell each local church what monies it shall raise, how much shall be sent to the general fund, what hymnbook shall be used in worship, what Ritual shall be used at Communion or Baptism? If not, must the Church of the future then be expected to decentralize the centralized organization of Methodism, or unliturgize the Episcopilians? In other words, what polity? And the readers of this article may well ask themselves if they too do not unconsciously think of the Church-that-is-to-be after the pattern of the one in which they now live. If so, let us admit that we have a long way to go to achieve the catholic mind.

At any rate, there will be no solution here unless and until the matter be faced squarely with each ready to yield something in the way of polity, as perhaps in the way of Creed. It is easy enough for loosely organized congregational churches to envision a "union" that shall express itself after the manner of one of their own conventions. What difference would it make to congregationally organized churches whether their delegates go to a convention of their own communicants, or to a convention representing all manner of other communicants, so long as that convention itself has no power to do more than advise or recommend? But would that be the union the world of Christians visualizes? It would be easy enough to create a world Church—if it could be called such—that should allow each component church or local congregation to believe as it pleases, to sing as it pleases, to worship as it pleases, to manage its own affairs as it pleases. In fact, we have that right now, so far as the mind of Protestantism is concerned. But is it catholicity?—and if not, what is?

Providence

CHARLES W. HARRIS

I AM conscious of the present prevalent disbelief in Providence. Any view which holds to a divine oversight in human affairs seems singularly out of place, incongruous to what we actually behold in nature and society.

We have invested its consideration with apathy, and those who would arouse us do not so much challenge our thought as irritate us. Nevertheless, the espousal of this truth is fundamental to Christian belief. Unless God cares, there is no God. That states it baldly but is it not the implication which lies beneath the Lord's Prayer, the Fatherhood of God and much else in the teaching of Christ? Parenthetically, I may state that the world in which Jesus lived was more hopeless than society today.

Perhaps we would not deny Providence, if we could define it more satisfactorily. The view that it is an intervention of the laws of nature in behalf of some favored person or persons is to deny it. But is such an intervention implied?

YESTERDAY'S FAITH

Those who have visited that ancient and delightful English city, Chester, have been asked, most likely, if they saw "God's Providence House"—a beautiful timbered construction of the seventeenth century, built, we are told in the plaque on the wall, in commemoration of the owner's immunity from a widespread, devastating plague from which he, it seems, had a miraculous escape. So he called the new house "God's Providence," a name which expressed more thankfulness than pride. It may seem to us that the building of a pretentious house as a monument made public what belonged to the domain of private devotion, but we are to remember that this was the seventeenth century, when men believed in special cases of Providence. The reasons they set forth may seem to us ridiculous or grotesque, but the instinct beneath them was a true one.

Had the owner lived in the twentieth century, the explanations for his escape would have overlaid so deeply the instinct to believe that it would have been forgotten. The sanitary engineer would have explained that immunity from infection was due to pure water in a man's own well. The

philosopher would deprecate the enumeration of special cases and warn him against illusions. His clergyman, while confessing to a belief in the beneficence of God, would be somewhat vague. He would remind him that belief in special Providence proved too much, citing the well-known instance of Hitler's escape from an explosion in a beer hall in Munich. The German deputy, Hess, had called it Providence, but the clergy of Chester agreed with Hitler that it was luck, for God, they reasoned, wouldn't be in a beer cellar, nor on the wrong side! In short, God's Providence House would not be built in Chester today.

From this it might reasonably be inferred that modern thinkers are confused about Providence, or else do not regard it. Recently I asked Bernard Iddings Bell, who hails from Rhode Island, if anyone in Providence believed in it. He answered, "Not many"; then added, hopefully, "But some believe in God." I thought of three hundred years ago, when Roger Williams, escaping the calumnies and unjust accusations of the Massachusetts Colony, made his way in midwinter to the shores of Narragansett Bay, where he purchased ground from the Indians. Here he laid the foundation for a new colony dedicated to toleration and named it Providence, for God, he felt, would dwell there.

TODAY'S BELIEF

Men today are not so skeptical as to deny Providence altogether. They concede a general, not a special, oversight. All men are beneficiaries of God's favor. The sun rises and the rain falls upon the just and the unjust, but this is to confuse Providence with nature.

Others are willing to subscribe to a belief in Providence, if you mean by it God's favor for a particular country like America. They profess to see in the founding of the colonial commonwealths a special Providence; so in the birth of independence, wars glorious and inglorious, and in territorial expansion—the gradual unfolding of a plan, which was first of all in the mind of God and then realized by man.

I suspect Presbyterians originated this view. Or were they Congregationalists? Certainly some of the former have supported it with great gusto. For myself, I have little inclination toward a belief that makes God a coworker in the imperialistic policy of the United States, which began with self-interest, the killing of Indians and the seizure of their lands, and was nourished in greed, as with covetous eyes men looked at the vast territory of the Southwest. Finally, this national policy of aggrandizement reached its culmination in our

trans-Pacific possessions. What is past is past. I do not even deprecate it, but it is difficult for me to see the hand of a directing Providence where so great a factor has been greed of land possession.

Doubts, therefore, are certain to arise whenever we contemplate political movements which are divorced from God. In this imperfect stage of society, this seems inevitable. The Church does not help by taking over the State. Whenever the Church, in the name of God, has identified herself with governments, she has made a botch of the business. "My kingdom," said Christ, "is not of this world." That a better day will dawn in the far future we may devoutly hope, but it will be the beginning of a new world order. As for the immediate present, Jesus despaired both for His own race and the nations, painting in dark colors coming events. But how reassuring His words concerning the individual! "Not a hair of your head shall perish." The great paean of the New Testament is the triumph of the individual over guilt and grief, over pain and death.

This is the reverse of our modern way of thinking. If we believe in Providence, we advance the view cautiously that perhaps God cares for things in the large, but is indifferent to the individual. But why do we thus reason? If He is sufficient at all, He is sufficient for all of life. Why set boundaries for God who is limitless, whose activities may be traced in the molecular changes of the small and near as truly as in the astronomically great and far away? Once you have subscribed to the theistic position, you are committed completely to a belief in God's power, presence and beneficence in nature and in human life. But as we have already indicated, there are difficulties for those who even tentatively grasp this view.

DIFFICULTIES

Much that we see about us, which we ourselves experience, is seemingly irreconcilable with the doctrine of Providence. No one thus far—and there has been much speculation—has been able to solve the mystery of pain. All one can do is to attempt an approximate solution.

This much is certain, that we are in a world where all living creatures strive and struggle to survive. Pain is a commonplace. There are inequalities, of course, but no one escapes who forms a part of what J. Arthur Thomson felicitously calls "the web of life," meaning the interrelation of all living creatures and plant life as well. Pain, suffering and death are our common lot. The mystery of individual pain resolves itself in the cosmic mystery.

This is the path upward. The scientist watches dispassionately the survival of the strong, which he calls natural selection, leading to new species and higher, more complex forms of life, until we come to man. Whatever our doubts as to his origin, we must confess his solidarity with the rest of creation when it comes to the allotment of suffering and the inexorable law of death.

In this world, which Goethe called a "nursery of spirits," there is no coddling. Life registers for the most successful a large percentage of defeats and then oblivion, or else survival in some new mode of life. It is due to Providence (some would say chance) that man is here at all. There have been times in the life of the individual, prenatal and in his subsequent existence, when his survival was threatened. Life hung by a thread. It was the flickering of a candle; a breath and it goes out. Man is, so to speak, the creature of a thousand chances. Hairbreadth escapes have been his lot until that last moment when are uttered the words, "The silver cord is loosed. The golden bowl is broken. The pitcher is broken at the well house." So with life, all life on the planet. It might have perished any time in the long millenniums of its history, but some way it has managed to survive and a living, not a dead, world rolls on in the sunbeams.

The balance of life by which nature maintains an equilibrium between the life it creates and the life it destroys, is a spectacle seemingly as precarious as it is fascinating to behold. It reproduces lavishly, especially in the lower orders, because of the enormous elimination which ensues. Myriads of living creatures appear, destined to survive for a day and then to perish as food for higher forms of life, as victims of starvation or climatic changes. A few survive to perpetuate the species or as pathfinders of a new order. So constant is the ratio between elimination and survival that over a very long period of time and in a given locality, we find neither over-population of a species nor its appreciable diminution. The contrivance is ingenious, but there is always the possibility of a fatality. Expert opinion informs us that a dearth of birds over a period of six or seven years would bring about such an enormous increase of insect life that vegetation would disappear and existence on the planet would no longer be possible for any save the very lowest forms of life. This marvelous adaptation of organisms to an end, the survival "after a thousand deaths," looks very much to me like Providence, or, if you prefer to have it stated in another way—"Intelligence."

The scientist protests that we do not need to introduce an intrusive factor like Providence or Intelligence, spelled with a capital. Nature, he affirms,

is controlled by laws or mechanical forces. She follows a pattern laid down. What we call design or beauty are terms of our own defining, registering the mind's impression. So some scientists who appear to borrow their terms at the pawnshop of philosophical idealism. Most scientists do not. They are impatient with those who profess to look behind the scenes. The process, they affirm, not the origin of life, is their concern.

It is possible that the average man of science misunderstands the theistic position. The theist does not deny secondary causes, nor the operation of laws. He only insists upon a spiritual interpretation of the universe. And in demanding this, he feels he is not irrational, nor unscientific. The definition doesn't matter—some call it evolution, some call it God. No one denies that nature follows a pattern, frequently a design of beauty, which in the higher orders of life is intricate and complex. But the theist views the pattern as first of all the thought of God. Creative life is continuous. It cannot be predicated merely of a remote past, but is here and now in the unwearied processes of nature, ever evolving new forms of life and beauty. Is it unreasonable to regard the universe as governed by Intelligence rather than blind mechanical forces? And if there is an obvious end in view, higher orders of created life, and a pattern, more intricate still, more revealing, why not call this intelligent oversight Providence and be done with doubt?

Chance, it seems to me, is ruled out in the beginning—in the origin of life. It is obviously ruled out in the present, where all created life obeys fixed laws. It is ruled from the future, if, with the poet, we admit purpose.

"And I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

As a child I played with anagrams, forming words with the little pasteboard letters. Had I thrown them into the air, they would not have fallen to make words. Not if I had tossed them a billion times would they have formed the soliloquy of Hamlet or the Gettysburg speech. Purpose, not chance; Providence, not mechanical forces, governs the universe.

A MODE OF WORKING

The difficulties which confront the individual in his acceptance of Providence are seemingly insurmountable. "Why do the innocent suffer?" "Why the inequalities in life, so that the deserving good have a maximum of pain and the wicked escape unscathed?" Fortunately, a deep instinct in man tells him that he is right in believing in the oversight of God, although he is

unable to answer all the questions. Perhaps he demands an intervention of God in cases where he should fall back upon his own unaided efforts. The assumption that Providence is another name for a benign and indulgent Deity who miraculously intervenes in human affairs is incorrect, for He uses agencies to carry on His work. Religion is not relief. It is the power which enables us to endure. We demand immediate aid of God, like the Negro in the Charleston earthquake—"Good Lord, come and help us. Oh, come now. And come yo'self, Lord; 'taint no time for boys!" And when no relief comes, we deny Providence, or, like Job, curse the day in which we were born.

I do not deny the supernatural. What I have already said indicates quite the contrary. In nature we see the operation of laws uniform and assuring; in her intricate and lovely forms the handwriting of God. Like Robinson Crusoe, we find tracks in the sand, but always God is beyond and hidden. His revelation is obscured partly because of our dimness of vision, partly because of His inscrutable will. He employs agencies. What we actually see are His messengers, the laws which obey His will, secondary causes and nature control.

It is not otherwise in human affairs. God will not do what man can do for himself. I heard a man say proudly, "I went to the Klondike in the gold rush days. With my own hands I dug out of the rocks enough gold to make myself financially independent." The world doesn't owe us a living, certainly not a comfortable one. Nature's allotment in the struggle of life is to give us blows and pain, cold and privation until, surmounting every obstacle, we have dug out of the rocks the gold—the fine gold of self-reliance. Does that leave God out? Not for those who interpret life spiritually.

There are three "controls"—nature control, the control of nature by man, and Remote Control. Man in his province is not supreme. Far from it. But he is important. When he comprehends nature, working harmoniously with her, he accomplishes great good. He is Providence, in a manner of speaking. He drains the marshes, destroys the mosquito and malaria no longer exacts its heavy toll. Health and happiness come to a people through those messengers of Providence, the scientist and the sanitary engineer.

An errand of mercy brings you to a desolate home. You find sickness, cold and hunger. There is a story of unemployment. But before you leave you will change misery into cheer. You become Providence to a needy family. The sense that we co-operate with God and that without us things cannot be made right, imparts a dignity to man which otherwise he would not have.

THE ASSURANCE OF THE WISE

In nature and in the topsy-turvy world in which we live, there is much to confute what we have tried to say.

The proof of spiritual truths by which men live, will not be found in anything external to us; not in the stars, not in the flowers that blossom at our feet, not in men's creeds, nor in their sacred writings. Spiritual truths are spiritually apprehended. We must look within ourselves, for the final confirmation of our beliefs. What other proof do they require who feel awe in the contemplation of the sublime; who with Kepler regarding the starry universe cry, "Almighty God, I think thy thoughts after thee!" Or who in the perception of beauty utter with Wordsworth,

"And I have felt
A Presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused;
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns
And the round ocean and the living air
And the blue sky and in the mind of man."

CONCLUSION

Let no one think that belief in Providence in human affairs is a faith easily acquired or kept. It may seem to the skeptic that we hold it lightly—a whistling in the dark as we go by the graveyard; but we know better. Who unmoved can look upon the spectacle of destroyed democracies, whose misfortune it was to be in the path of ruthless despotic powers? "Where is God now?" men ask.

But among those things which are most surely believed—to use a Pauline phrase—is belief in moral order. Of this, Sophocles twenty-three centuries ago spoke in these moving words, of Antigone before the king:

"Nor could I think thine edict of such might
That one who is mortal thus could override
The *infallible unwritten laws of Heaven*.
Their majesty begins not from today,
But from eternity, and none can tell
The hour that saw their birth."

The acceptance of a moral order is universal. Its expression in law and statute is man's noblest achievement, destined to endure when all material things have crumbled to dust. The Magna Charta and the Declaration of

Independence are side by side. Law is man's oldest and newest achievement. No one can flaunt the moral order with impunity—no individual, no state. Like shining rails traversing a continent, it runs abreast our civilization bearing precious freight. Let men leave those rails, and they are destroyed. This is equally true of one man or of many, however different the punishment meted out.

To name this moral order Providence, is to speak truly. It is to affirm that God is not only behind nature, but history as well. It is difficult to find Him when evil triumphs over good. Who could see Providence in the sufferings of Jesus Christ, culminating in an ignominious death? Where then was divine oversight? Here was abuse of power, the triumph of evil, and the face of the sky was not darker than the pall of grief which descended upon His followers, until one ray of light pierced the gloom, and the words were uttered, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

What is Providence? It is the guiding hand in the dark. It is the voice by the threshold:

"He shall fear no evil.
The Lord shall preserve thy going out
From this time forth and forever more."

The man who heeds these words, fears nothing. He is unafraid, even of death, for death is only another threshold.

The Results of the Written Gospel

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON

BEFORE our Gospels, even in their most original form of scattered traditions about the sayings and doings of Jesus of Nazareth, had been committed to writing, there was the Church (*ecclesia*) or community of believers in Jesus. Without these Gospels in writing, however, nothing would have been widely known of the Founder of our religion save that He had been a popular Teacher who had been put to death in Jerusalem, had risen from the grave, ascended into Heaven, from whence His disciples expected Him to return, as the victorious Christ or deliverer of God's people.

If this be so, it may be permissible to try to imagine what sort of a message the first followers of Jesus delivered, before the gospel as we now have it was given to the Jews, and later to mankind; and our chief guides are the speeches recorded in the Acts of the Apostles as representing the most primitive preaching, and the correspondence of Saint Paul as the earliest written expressions of the mind of a convert to the new religion, which are the more interesting as he probably never had known Christ "after the flesh."

When Saint Peter on the day of Pentecost spoke to the people, he explained that the mysterious tongues of fire were a sign that men should repent and be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ"; he said nothing of the ministry of our Lord, but rested the whole proof of His Messianic office on the Resurrection. Only once subsequently does he speak of his Master's work on earth, namely, in his address to Cornelius that "He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil." The gospel in these speeches is simply that Jesus was crucified and had risen.

Saint Paul was converted, not to the Christian Church, but to Jesus Christ; for his whole personality was absorbed by that of his Master, or, as he says, "Christ liveth in me." Yet in his letters there are few allusions either to the earthly ministry or even to the words of Jesus. With, of course, the exception of the Death and Resurrection, he makes mention of little related in the Gospels save the Institution of the Last Supper. One might even say that to him the Christ who died and rose and still lives is of

more interest than the Jesus who ministered on earth. Not that Saint Paul does not emphasize the human nature of our Lord; but what he seems to desire especially to impress upon his converts is the importance of realizing the divinity of the Christ, who transcends all things in heaven and earth.

The idea now prevalent is that Jesus was known as a man who was deified later by the enthusiasm of His disciples; but in the light of contemporary ideas this view is misleading, since after the Resurrection the difficulty was to understand not His divinity but the fullness of His humanity.

Without the gospel in permanent form we would never have had a record of the character of the Master as He lived as man on earth. It is the evangelists who have made Him real; and in this sense they may be considered the founders of our religion; because they have brought men into actual contact with Jesus. But to do this, they had to describe Him as He appeared to those who had not grasped the truth about their Master, but only realized that they were in the company of One who, remarkable as He was, was in every respect a man. To understand Him we must have a similar experience in our endeavor to arrive at an estimate of His human character—a task which must be undertaken without irreverence.

It may be paradoxical to say that it was, and still is, more difficult to think of Jesus Christ as God, than as man. The Jew was taught that his God had spoken to humanity and had even appeared to His chosen servants. To the Gentile this idea was widespread and familiar. A great man was proclaimed to be a god, including not only emperors, but individuals who did famous deeds or wrought miracles.

No wonder, therefore, that one of the very earliest heresies was the denial that Jesus Christ was truly man. It seemed incredible that there was ever such a human being, and that really God appeared in what men called Jesus, but was only a phantom, destitute of any of the limitations of humanity. The life of Jesus would have been a delusion. He would neither have suffered, known disappointment, temptation or even death, because these things are not part of the Divine Nature. Our faith might have ended in nothing but a dream, but for the Four Evangelists giving us a clear picture of Jesus as man.

This old Docetic heresy has long been unconsciously prevalent. There is a danger that, in our desire to honor Jesus as God, we fear to even think of Him as man; and in so doing we deem it almost a blasphemy to

realize His human qualities; yet we must boldly endeavor to depict the historic Jesus without irreverence.

In all investigations as to the career and character of any remarkable man, attention is generally directed to his antecedents and education. In these Jesus was eminently at an advantage, as He certainly was, from the world's point of view, of good family and well-educated. He was regarded as the son of Joseph, a descendant of David; a man highly respected by his Jewish neighbors; and His mother, Mary, was a kinswoman of the priest Zecharias, the father of the prophet, John the Baptist. His brothers and sisters were well-known and one of them, James, was in after days the leader of the Church in Jerusalem. His family, as is related by the earliest church historians, preserved their pedigree with scrupulous care. That Jesus was regarded as of the House of David by the Jews is evident; and it is impossible that in a country like Palestine, where everybody's family was known, this claim could have been fabricated in later years. Multitudes would not have flocked to one whose ancestry was doubted.

In addition to belonging to a family of some distinction, Jesus was well educated. Illiteracy seems to have been rare among the Jews; if only because children were taught to read the Law and understand the meaning of its precepts. In Saint John's Gospel the Jews ask, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (7. 15), but in one chapter of Mark Jesus shows His knowledge, not only of the Law, but of the method of interpretation in the Rabbinic Schools. At Nazareth, Greek was almost certainly spoken as well as Aramaic, and if the author of the general Epistle of James was Jesus' "brother" His family may be presumed to have handled the language with remarkable skill. The assertion popularly made that the household of Joseph consisted of ignorant peasants is utterly fallacious, and the parables of our Lord reveal that He had been brought up amid intelligent middle-class surroundings of people engaged in business, and employers of hired labor. Circles of this description in all ages and countries are rarely illiterate.

Saint Luke's is the only Gospel to tell us anything of the childhood, youth and early manhood of Jesus; and it leaves us with the impression that the Holy Family could hardly have been reckoned among the poor. We know this partly from its evidently being their custom to visit Jerusalem to attend the feasts; which would be impossible for a family of peasants in abject poverty. On the whole, we are left with the impression that Jesus

was brought up in a strictly religious Jewish household, was educated in His religious duties, and probably learned Joseph's trade as a craftsman. These influences had their effect in shaping His human character as He "increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men." He may be said to have displayed many of the finer qualities incident in such an upbringing. The Sermon on the Mount is a remarkable confirmation of this.

This famous collection of the sayings of Jesus is placed by Saint Matthew as preface to the account of the ministry of the Lord, and has always been taken as the Law which He expected His followers to observe. Many passages in it still remain as the very essence of Christ's religion; and indeed no religion which has for its object the furtherance of human morality can afford to dispense with them, as they are the foundations necessary to every civilized society. The distinguishing feature of this discourse is that it embodies a code applicable to all men. It may be said that one of the causes of the rapid spread of Christ's religion was due to its being easily understood by the common man as a rule of life, the simplicity of which and the ease with which it could be understood revealing a wisdom truly divine.

There is one book in the New Testament which reveals something of the mind and character of Jesus in this respect, namely, the general epistle of Saint James, attributed to the brother of the Lord. This remarkable document is addressed to the twelve tribes of the Dispersion and is not strictly a letter, but what is called a "diatribe," or general exhortation, or sermon, exhorting its readers to virtue. It resembles in some way the Sermon on the Mount, and is the work of one who knew Jesus. It reflects Jesus' love of nature, His illustrations from daily life, His simple, yet deeply practical common sense. It may be that it reveals the piety of the Family in Nazareth of which the author was a member honored in his after-life as the Lord's brother. Its style is that of a well-educated man who used the language of a Jew familiar with the best Greek of his age and throws a light on the education of the youthful Jesus.

It is almost startling to realize that the childhood and youth of Jesus were spent in a business community. Yet Galilee in His day was thickly populated, and its inhabitants largely engaged in business. Men bought and sold, invested their money, cultivated farms, vineyards and gardens, exported the fish they caught and prepared for the market, entered into

partnerships, hired or bought their servants, and on the whole pursued industrial careers. This is shown in the Parables of our Lord, which are generally taken from the sort of lives to which His disciples and hearers were accustomed. That of "the Laborers in the Vineyard," of "the Pounds and Talents," "the Unmerciful Servant," to mention a few, throw much light on the relation of employer and employed, and incidentally indicate the class with which Jesus was associated on earth.

The idea that the gospel of our Lord was directed against the rich in favor of the poor is not justified by the teaching of Jesus. He did not spend time in denouncing great sins which all agreed in condemning, but those faults to which both rich and poor are addicted and are apt to consider almost as virtues: excessive anxiety to provide for the future, cruel exactation even of just debts, jealousy of one man's being more liberally treated than another, harsh judgments, and the like. For these and all forms of hypocrisy in the profession of religion or ostentation in advertising piety or liberality, the discourses of Jesus showed little mercy, their object being not so much a social reformation but a change of heart which would make the bad conditions of human life impossible. To Him the covetous Pharisee, who made religion profitable, was abhorrent. In the parable, the Pharisee thanks God that he abstains from all notorious vices, with which by implication he charges the publican. Nor is he entirely without excuse in his estimate; the popular estimate of the *publicani* in Palestine being justifiable. Yet the influence of our Lord on this class for good is truly remarkable. Saint Matthew the Apostle, who obeyed the call of Jesus, and Zacchaeus the rich chief-publican are examples. We are so apt to imagine that "the publicans and sinners" were an abject class in Palestine, that it is necessary to remind ourselves that, if religiously they were so considered by the orthodox Jew, they were really bankers and financiers. The "sinners" were men of the world or, in Rabbinic language, "the people of the Land."

The ministry of our Lord, judged by its results, can only be considered as miraculous. For nineteen centuries its influence has been diffused among mankind under the most changing conditions. It has been the inspiration of the noblest of lives and the most heroic of actions. A great part of the human race professes under different forms the religion of Jesus Christ, but the influence of His Spirit has been widely felt by those outside, and one of the chief clues to the mystery of the diffusion of the Faith is found in the four Gospels as we now have them.

William Adams Brown: A Teacher and His Times¹

JOHN W. LANGDALE

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN was born into a family of vast business influence and high social distinction. For him opportunities could have been found in almost any field he cared to enter. When he chose the ministry, he could have adopted the language of Professor Ladd—he would never have thought of doing it—"My contribution to charity is \$50,000 annually, that being the amount I would have made in business." His father was a church leader and his mother a profoundly religious woman. Her father was a clergyman, and she brought up her first-born boy to think of the ministry as the most exalted office to which man can attain. When later she heard him preach, she thought not of her son in the pulpit, but of a voice through which a higher than man brought her a message concerning the eternities.

Throughout his life Doctor Brown has been in contact with interesting and stimulating personalities. Many will be fascinated by his descriptions of life in New York during the later middle half of last century. There were famous professors at Yale and Union in his student days. He was most impressed by Adolf Harnack, whom he had in postgraduate study in Berlin, and whom he describes as a man of conviction disciplined by knowledge and tempered with sympathy. Soon after he began his teaching career, he came into intimate friendship with Dr. William Newton Clarke. Thereafter he has had some association with nearly all the outstanding personalities of his times. His characterizations of them are brilliant, as when he describes Bishop William Fraser McDowell as a man of imposing presence, at once dignified and genial, with a face of signal benignity and beauty, and a friendly spirit which made him at home with all sorts and conditions of men.

Recognizing, as also did his parents, that too exclusive preoccupation with academic matters made it difficult to keep the warmth of the inner life unimpaired, Doctor Brown would fain have begun his ministry in a pastorate. Instead, he was constrained to join the faculty of Union Seminary, in whose service he continued for forty-four years. Throughout, he has insisted upon the need of a theology which can be preached as the gospel of the righteous

¹ *William Adams Brown: A Teacher and His Times.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.50.

and loving Father-God, who entered humanity in the man Christ Jesus and gave Himself for the life of the world.

From the beginning, Doctor Brown devoted himself to extra-mural interests and activities. He fought the corruption sponsored by Tammany Hall and had much to do with the founding of Labor Temple. He bore much of the burden associated with the alleged heresies of Professor Charles A. Briggs. As Secretary of the General War-Time Commission of the Churches, he exercised a most influential ministry during the war years. As Acting Provost of Yale University, he co-operated with numerous educational leaders. After he had taken issue in a public discussion with Professor James H. Leuba, who had contended that God as taught in the churches was outdated, he was elected President of the Religious Educational Association. Thinking of the Church as the society of those who through their relation to God are conscious of a fellowship which transcends race, nation and class and makes them members of an international fellowship, he was naturally led to share his superior abilities widely. In 1916 he spent several months in Japan and China, where in a series of lectures he interpreted Christianity to the Eastern mind. He gave about half a year to India as a member of the Lindsay Commission in a study of Christian education adapted to that land. The presidency of the Near East College Association took him abroad for another extended period. He was prominent in the various ecumenical meetings that have been held, finding most satisfaction in his share of the leadership of the Stockholm Conference in 1925.

The story of this illustrious life is told in the pellucid style with which readers of Doctor Brown's widely circulated books are familiar. Throughout, there is the to-be-expected absence of any sense of self-importance; instead, always the satisfaction in usefulness. Our generation has had many commanding Christian leaders. S. Parkes Cadman had a boundless preaching ministry, especially through the radio. John R. Mott continues a potent and pervasive career of immense proportions. The record of achievement as set forth in this autobiography will shine with the brightest. It has been the reviewer's good fortune to be intimately associated with Doctor Brown's activities of the past twenty years, and several of them that would adorn the average biography are here not even mentioned. Doctor Brown continues in leadership as busily as ever, with a mind full of vitality and a heart abounding in good will for humanity. Surely there must ever be a place in the universe of God for persons who love and would serve as does William Adams Brown.

Book Reviews

Personalities of the Old Testament.

By FLEMING JAMES. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00.

THIS is a large and imposing volume and contains much more than is suggested by the title. We have here a résumé of Hebrew history from Moses to Daniel expressed in studies of the emerging creative personalities who made that history. This method of writing history gives us a concrete and living presentation and it is particularly rewarding in the case of the Old Testament, for the Old Testament is concrete living and animated by the very nature of the Hebrew genius. Such a living treatment uncovers values that are apt to be lost or unobserved in more abstract study. The author's method is peculiarly suitable in the case of the Old Testament.

Doctor James has given us studies of the main characters of the Hebrew story, and these characters he has set in their historical environment. Their writings, or the records of their intromissions with the public life of Israel, are examined briefly and we have so much as is required of Old Testament Introduction. Their significance for the life of Israel is estimated and their religious teaching evaluated, so that we have here a manual of somewhat comprehensive scope dealing with historical, critical, and theological questions. To that extent, perhaps, the volume suffers a little in that it attempts so much, for the living interest that adheres to the personalities is somewhat lost in those other abstract details. Nevertheless, the personalities are so great and so vital that their living power shines through in spite of limitations imposed by the author's purpose.

The author is characterized by sanity and caution on all literary and theological issues; at times he seems unduly conservative. In the analysis of character Doctor Fleming reveals real insight and sympathetic understanding and his treatment is characterized by freshness and originality. There is here, also, a full and competent knowledge of the relevant literature, and a select bibliography and full indices are incorporated in the volume. The author has laid the educated layman, the student of the Old Testament, and the preacher under a debt of gratitude for this notable volume.

JOHN PATERSON.

Drew University.

Christians in an Unchristian Society.

By ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE.
New York: Association Press. 50
cts.

THIS volume by Doctor Tittle is the eighth in the significant Hazen series and, like the others, comprises *multum in parvo*. For those who are aware of the increased tension between Christian ideals and what used to be known as "the world, the flesh and the devil," this provides an excellent guide to thought and action. A quarter century ago, Christians were seeking to obliterate the contrast between the sacred and the secular, aiming to make all of life sacred. A noble ambition! But when the process of secularization began to make such inroads upon religion as to threaten its very life, religionists recognized that a fresh recognition of the contrast must be the price of survival.

This book frankly asserts the contrast and deals with some of the major decisions that a Christian, living in an evil

world, must make if he takes his religion seriously. The approach is definitely religious. The fatuous bravado with which we used to say that "the world is in our hands" and the naïve faith that we could bring in the Kingdom, is absent. Any belief in the coming Kingdom must be based upon the presence of God working in human history to bring about His righteous purposes.

The ideals of the Kingdom derive from Christ, and from His revelation we may judge that God's desires are definitely at variance with the present status in the matter of cruel race discrimination, gross inequalities of economic condition, concentration of power in a few hands, ruthless competition, individual, class, national. The Kingdom is not identified with any particular form of government or system, but the Christian State would guarantee freedom, economic opportunity and spiritual advantages to its citizens and would look beyond its own borders with sympathy toward all men.

Christianity is revolutionary, but differs from ordinary revolutionary theory with respect to (a) the value it seeks—not wealth but brotherhood, (b) the need of a changed heart in man, in addition to any changed machinery, (c) its means of accomplishment, not force but love. Violence defeats its own end, is "grotesquely unsuited to human nature" and is "tragically incompatible with the nature and purpose of God."

The fourth and last chapter outlines six traditional attitudes of the Church toward the "world," and lines up with the Calvinistic ideal of shaping the State to Christian ideals. "A Christian society . . . will never appear in the form of a theocracy," but not to affirm "the right of God through Jesus Christ to rule over the whole domain of human life . . . is to invite disaster."

The analysis of the book is clear and well reasoned, but its greatest contribution is that it sees evil in an evil generation without either blinking or wavering in its faith in the ultimate triumph of good.

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON.
Franklin Street Methodist Church,
Johnstown, Pa.

The Church and a Christian Society.

By WADE CRAWFORD BARCLAY.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$3.50.

THE title of this book gives only a general idea of its subject. A subtitle informs us further that it is a discussion of aims, content and method of Christian education. But even this is not the whole story, for when we scan the table of contents and open to the Introduction, we see that the author's primary concern is with the Christian education of adults.

A delineation in bold strokes of the growing movement of general adult education in this country serves as an introduction and gives the background for adult Christian education. The author then proceeds to picture the Christian Church as it exists and is responsive to the present world situation, and indicates that these conditions broadly define the educational task of the Church today (page 55). He then takes off on a rapid journey through the history of Christian education since the Reformation, and through so doing, shows the strands of influence which have produced our present-day Christian educational philosophy and method, not nearly all of which have been or can be woven into a single smooth and effective rope. The objectives of adult Christian education are seen "in the light of new and inescapable factors in the present situation" which are fully discussed and are found in the direction

of the development of Christian persons and of a Christian society. While the "profit economy" is condemned in a single paragraph of sixteen lines, which may be judged as an inadequate basis for such condemnation even by one whose liberal economic views are so well known as Doctor Barclay's, this paragraph is followed by a characterization of a society which is Christian which is so opposite to a society under "profit economy" that it is difficult to see how there can be any argument on the other side. This discussion of objectives is followed by a number of chapters giving detailed consideration to the way in which these objectives may come to fruition. The high point is reached in the consideration of education as social participation. Four chapters on method and curricula, with an entire chapter devoted to the discussion method of teaching, complete our long and rewarding journey in quest of the meaning of adult religious education.

This is a thoroughly competent and scholarly job, and one which will have wide and lasting influence. It is a big book—too big in many ways, for it gives space to much which the reader should get from other sources (as, for instance, the psychology of personality, the nature and function of worship), so that he might go more directly to the distinctive contribution of this book. On the other hand, the book should be still bigger in order to include adequate discussion as to how a program of adult education may be organized and administered in the local church in order to achieve the ideals which have been so ably presented. It is more than a book on adult Christian education, for much of the discussion is equally appropriate as a basis for Christian education of children and young people. This reviewer rejoices in a book which is distinctly of graduate and professional level

in a field where most of our material is written for lay workers.

PAUL H. VIETH.

Horace Bushnell Professor
of Christian Nurture.
Yale Divinity School.

With the Twelve. By CARL A. GLOVER. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

THOSE of us who have had our fill of contradictory books purporting to give us the exact facts about Jesus, open a book of this sort with deep misgivings. But if we read, as all men should, what this author says in his Preface, the misgivings will disappear. And as we read on in this transparently honest volume, the conviction will grow that this is a genuinely distinctive book, a delightful exception to a rule that has become all too universal. To a fundamentalist, this book, with its adherence to the most modern of scholarship, will be a deal of an offense. The man who expects this book to be something it never was meant to be will also experience displeasure. But for those who wish the teachable and preachable material concerning Jesus, this book sets a good table; a very good table indeed!

It is the author's aim to present the collective training Jesus gave His disciples through successive stages, and then to sketch each disciple individually. If one were to say that this is all there is to the book, one would say enough; for the fidelity with which this task is executed, the spiritual insights which it records, the clarity of the style, the cumulative impact made upon the reader as picture after picture unfolds "the One altogether lovely," and the contemporaneousness every chapter possesses, would make the reading of this book as rewarding as any book on the New Testament could hope to be.

But the author surpassed his aim. What has plagued the Church more than almost anything else has been *the study of Jesus in isolation*. Here Jesus is shown in His relationships. Here it is made crystal clear that Jesus was not just something, or did not just teach something, *to* the twelve, but that He was something *with* them, and did something *through* them. Here Jesus is seen to be making, not just a revelation of His mind and spirit, but a revelation *in* minds and spirits. Here the nature of the contacts Jesus made, and the sort of concepts He imparted, become the basis of a fellowship that was to incarnate the life of Christ for all time to come. "In the name of their victorious Master," says the closing phrase of the loveliest chapter in the book, "The Glorious Company," "they became the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the city set upon a hill." It is this conviction that the Jesus who was "with the twelve," barring only Judas, became in and through them, the indwelling Christ, which this book clinches.

It would be easy to find fault with certain aspects of this volume. There are judgments expressed with which readers will not agree. The quoting of Agnes Lee's widely known "Motherhood," or Gilder's famous "Song of a Heathen," does not bespeak that knowledge of more current English poetry which could have stood him in such good stead. And occasionally, the author forgets that he is not in the pulpit when he writes a book! But these are minor defects. The book may safely be heralded as a major contribution to the thinking of any preacher and teacher. It is by way of setting a new goal for future students of the Gospels to reach or surpass.

JOHN M. VERSTEEG.
Walnut Hills-Avondale Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

God's Control. By SAMUEL M. SHOEMAKER. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.50.

To know the book, *God's Control*, is to know the author, and vice versa. The book is indicative and characteristic of the author and his preaching. It is warm-hearted, spiritually penetrating and full of staccato-like sentences. Its pages breathe a warm evangelistic faith and a love for the Christian Church. While deeply conscious of the failures of the Church, he nevertheless possesses a burning desire to see her become all her Lord intended her to become.

The book abounds in quotable sentences and passages, and offers many sermonic suggestions. There is a "thou art the man" directness to the sixteen chapters, which in reality are sixteen sermons.

From the title, *God's Control*, one might expect a theological treatise on the sovereignty of God. It lacks the closely-woven pattern of a theological treatise, yet it is theology in action. The book rings the changes on the Group nomenclature and the social phase to which it has more recently emerged, namely, Moral Rearmament. Doctor Shoemaker firmly believes that "the thing that is going to happen next" is a "great movement of people Godward, a spiritual mass movement, an awakening from on high, God's spirit let loose in our midst, God's answer to our nation and our time." His passion is to arouse the Church and every Christian to united, active co-operation through "God's Control!"

In spite of wars and rumors of wars, I firmly believe history will, and is sustaining the author's contention. The chapters deal with the Church, with home life, with the nation as a whole, and in every chapter there is the insistent personal challenge, "What are you going to do about the present crisis?"

Each chapter is separate and distinct (as

sermons should be), yet there is an underlying mood that connects them and weaves them into a whole. The book will prove profitable reading for layman and minister and cannot help but do good. If there is any one weakness in the book, it is the absence of references. Doctor Shoemaker might have strengthened his position had he called in other witness to bear testimony to his position. There are numerous personal experiences related in the course of the book which make it vibrant with life. "He who touches this book, touches a man," and more, he touches a great spiritual movement. It is written in a style that "he who runs may read," and he who reads will have to begin to run.

JOHN PEMBERTON, JR.

St. Paul's Methodist Church,
Ocean Grove, New Jersey.

This Nation Under God. By ARTHUR E. HOLT. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company. \$2.00.

THERE is grave need of honest and thorough discussions of democracy today in theory and practice, against the confused and alarming perspective of the contemporary scene at home and abroad. Such a discussion, and one of unusual clarity and insight, this book affords, from the evangelical Christian standpoint.

That standpoint, as represented by a writer of poised mind trained in the critical techniques of modern thinking, appears convincingly as the only view adequate to this subject matter. For the democratic principle is evidently no other than the social expression of Jesus' ethic, grounded in his sure perception of the eternal as man's source and proper environment.

To date, the practice called democratic has at best no more than vaguely adumbrated its underlying principle, and at worst departs from it far and grievously.

These unpleasant facts, due both to low private and public morals and to inadvertent developments under the socially revolutionary régime of the machine in the past century and a half, are brought out uncompromisingly by Doctor Holt.

Nevertheless, the democratic principle still stands as the one hope of a decent national and international order, in contrast with the beguiling claptrap of competitive collectivism as well as with conspicuous abuses within the nominally democratic economies. Doctor Holt's examination of the alternatives to democracy as an ideal is as satisfying as his skill in pointing the way forward toward its attainment through cultivation of the habit and norms of responsible living, beginning with the primary social units—the family and the small community—and extending to studious improvement of the mutual understanding between segments of the general community at present still artificially segregated, such as, for instance, the farm with its problems on the one hand, and the city with its roaring pace and clamant demands on the other.

Doctor Holt significantly defines the liberty at which democracy aims as freedom for responsible living. Against a sharply delineated historical background of the causes of the current crisis, and with illustrations from his own experience through many years of social service and action in the Chicago area which give point and tang of earthy reality to the positions he advances, he examines the potential contributions of the leading groups and vocations, and especially of the Church and the school, to the betterment which he foresees as being well within our reach if we seriously choose to pursue it. But that betterment, he insists, cannot be won save on the basis of the moral reorientation of the individual and the education of his social conscience.

Here, rather than in the drafting of blue-prints for a new social order, he sees the true function of organized religion in this field.

Throughout the discussion one feels that here is no thin and vaporous or fanatical reformism, but the careful observation plus the tested conviction of a man whose hopes for mankind start, as every Christian's should, from a strong and serene personal awareness of God in Christ. Doctor Holt's friends will feel that in these pages he has done himself justice. There could be no higher tribute to the book.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD.
Old South Church in Boston.

Their Future Is Now. The growth and development of Christian personality. By ERNEST M. LIGON. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.00.

NOTEWORTHY is the fact that this book is an outgrowth of fourteen years of study of the problem: Would a person be mentally healthy or unhealthy if he obeyed implicitly the teachings of Jesus?, the development of a local church character education program in accordance with principles of character development based upon Jesus' teachings, and the systematic laboratory testing annually of pupils of the church school in which the program is in use.

The distinctive features of the character education program as stated by the author are: (1) definite goals for character development, eight traits based upon the teachings of Jesus and developed in the light of modern psychology; (2) emphasis on individual differences, involving the use of a comprehensive personality profile with approximate methods for the measurement of traits; (3) the effort to measure progress in personality develop-

ment through the use of questionnaires at regular intervals; and (4) the presentation of a drama-type method of character education involving the use of curricular units suited to the individual abilities and needs of the children using them, intended to give intensive and skilled training in social integration.

The eight trait goals which, if "learned," the author believes will result in the Christian type of personality are set forth under the two categories of "experimental faith," "the sort of faith Jesus taught," and "fatherly love," "the type of love Jesus taught." They are these: (1) vision, including such specific attitudes as constructive imagination, wholesome desire for self-improvement, an optimistic desire for a better social order, and the ambition always to do things better; (2) love of righteousness and truth; (3) faith in the friendliness of the universe; (4) dominating purpose in the service of mankind; (5) being sensitive to the needs of others; (6) forgiveness; (7) magnanimity; (8) Christian courage.

The program is set forth in a series of chapters describing and interpreting its use in the successive age levels or periods of development.

If objection is urged that such a program is too complex and difficult for use by the church school the obvious answer, as the author suggests, is that intelligent people now know that character education is not simple and that "over-simplified systems are doomed to failure before they begin."

Students of Christian education reading the book will raise various questions, not least of which will concern the validity of the theory of religious education in terms of generalized traits. While the author avows his belief in the theory, it should be said to his credit that he claims no finality or unfallibility for the pro-

gram advocated and solicits criticisms and revisions.

Most encouraging is it to know that there are churches and church schools which take their responsibility for character education seriously enough systematically to undertake a program of the type and scope this book describes. That fact is in itself evidence of progress in the direction of development of a science of Christian education.

WADE CRAWFORD BARCLAY.
Secretary of The Joint Committee on Religious Education in Foreign Fields.

The Knowledge of God. By D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.00.

PROFESSOR TRUEBLOOD, of Stanford University, takes up and expands in this volume the theme of his Swarthmore Lecture on *The Trustworthiness of Religious Experience*. It is a fascinating volume, and stands definitely in the great American tradition, for it takes religious experience in complete seriousness. Indeed, experience is the "primary datum" of religion, for which neither rational proofs nor a theology of pure, unaccountable revelation is an adequate substitute. For the proofs, to be understood, require antecedent experience. Otherwise they are as incomprehensible as a formula using some unknown, artificial, even absurd code; for example (let us make one up!) $xnp^8(r/m)=eq$: therefore, God exists! And a theology of pure revelation which discounts or discredits the human factor equally fails of logical leverage: how can we know it is *true* revelation? As even Barth, "perhaps off guard" (p. 52), admits when he says that the Christian Word is acknowledged as true since "the transformation in Christ from death to life concerns [the Christian] personally."

On the other hand, granted the genuineness and the truth of the direct, em-

pirical religious experience, both the classical proofs and the theology of revelation take on new cogency and meaning.

The book is a refreshing contrast to the pessimistic and negative strain now commonly trumpeted as the last word in theology and philosophy of religion—a theme that runs, "Life is hard; defeat of all human striving is inevitable; more than all that, even God Himself is arrayed against us." How any such dreary denial of the highest human hopes can be identified with the good news of the gospel of Christ passes the comprehension of a mere historian. And yet it appears that over wide areas of our current systematic theology and even of current Christian preaching there has been a more or less complete response to this post-bellum (or inter-bellum) credo.

The author does not hesitate to lay all the weight it will bear upon religious experience. It may not be "the only thing in religion," but "in the logical structure of faith it has a uniquely primary position. It does not solve every problem . . . but it gives a starting point on which we may reasonably depend. It does not involve infallibility or complete certainty, but gives instead the kind of high probability to which the scientific mind is accustomed and with which it is satisfied" (p. 10). It "demands interpretation" (p. 12), and yet it is genuinely cognitive, not illusory or merely inferential. Indeed, the alleged knowledge of God is "really not more, but rather less amazing than a knowledge of sticks and stones, which are so alien to our natures" (p. 21).

It may seem to some readers that the author goes too far in being ready to consider as veridical even the evidence supplied in abnormal states—which provided Leuba, for example, with material for his criticism of mysticism; and yet the burden of the argument does not rest there. The witnesses are, on the whole, and among

them the greatest human souls, "people of *undoubted* sanity" (p. 131).

This is a book that deserves to be widely read, and its message to be widely and vigorously preached—especially at the present time!

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

Union Theological Seminary,
New York City.

**John Wesley und das deutsche Kirch-
enlied.** Von DR. JOHN L. NUEL-
SEN. Anker-Verlag, Bremen.

BISHOP NUELSEN has here given—in a book of 222 pages octavo—a hymnological study of the first order. While every serious student of religious history is familiar with the broad fact of the extraordinary significance of hymn singing in the Methodist movement, surely no one can read this study of the relation of John Wesley to German hymnody without learning much that is really important or without being stirred to an unusual pitch of personal interest by a vital contact with great saints and great movements of other days. Whatever may be one's judgment of the relative merits of the Wesleyan hymns, no one can question that the Wesleys did incomparably more than all others for hymn singing in the eighteenth century. This book of Bishop Nuelsen's, while affording delightful glimpses into the large region of song in early Methodism, deals specially, and with a hitherto unapproached completeness, with John Wesley and German hymnody. With wonderful vividness the whole course of John Wesley's relation to the evangelical hymns of Germany is set forth, beginning with the mighty impression made upon him by Bishop Nitschmann and his fellow Moravians on the long voyage to Georgia in 1736, and deepened by his later visit to Herrnhut and to the Pietists of Halle. His thirty-three translations from the German hymns as known to him in the

Moravian *Gesangbuch* seem all to have been made in Georgia before his return to England. Five of these translations from the German (along with three which he made from other languages) appeared in his *Collection of Psalms and Hymns*, which he caused to be printed in Charles-Town, South Carolina, in 1737. This little collection of 78 pieces is now recognized as the earliest of all Anglican hymnbooks (distinguished from psalmbooks).

Wesley was not the first English translator of German hymns, but it was he who first gave them wide currency in translation. Naturally so, for he translated with incomparably greater skill than his predecessors. Moreover, no successor in this field has surpassed him. Nuelsen treats his subject comprehensively, yet with delightful succinctness, concreteness and clarity. We are told how Wesley learned German from his Moravian friends and how he was captured by their enthusiasm for worship in song. We gain a deeper insight into the significance of German hymnody for his religious development. Indeed, the book indicates a remarkable number of points of vital interest, which shed much light not only upon Wesley's own inner life but also upon the religious history of his era. A critical appreciation of his skill as translator is given at some length, with an impressive statistical showing of the widespread use of his translations in the hymnbooks of all the principal denominations in England and America. Credit is given Wesley also for the introduction of many German chorales into church use in England. A complete list of all Wesley's collections of hymns for congregational use is illuminated by many instructive notes. Finally, we have the complete texts of the original German hymns and of Wesley's versions.

J. R. VAN PELT.
Hartford, Conn.

Saints in Action. By DUMAS MALONE.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$2.00.

DUMAS MALONE, director of the Harvard University Press, has produced in this volume a competent roll call of American sainthood. The book comprises a series of lectures delivered at Drew in March, 1939. Making constant use of his past experience as an editor of the *Dictionary of American Biography*, Doctor Malone has set out, in his own words, as "a layman, who is not a specialist in religious history or biography, to draw illustrations of saintliness from the rich record of American achievement as a whole and to apply to the deeds of certain religious men and women the tests of honest but finite personal judgment." Doctor Malone's native hagiography is based upon William James's criteria of saintliness in the *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and no further definitions beyond James's are attempted. The book is chiefly one of illustration, a saints' calendar without the days, a frankly personal selection from a platform of Christian liberalism.

And it is inevitable, I suppose, that each reader will quarrel, on personal grounds, with this selection. Doctor Malone expects such a response, invites it. He roughly arranges his saints in chapters dealing with the clergy in America, reformers, women saints, educators, and "secular saints of learning." In an introductory chapter he pays homage in other fields and callings. To this reviewer there appear to be dubious inclusions and unfortunate omissions. Emily Dickinson seems, for instance, better to represent "gentle saintliness expressing itself in literary form" than Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, the pious authoress of *Gates Ajar*. And John Woolman has a fragrance of humble holiness which few of Doctor Malone's clerics can match. But

the general lines and qualities of the book are more important than questions of specific selection. And in general terms, *Saints in Action* is challenging.

It is only indirectly a comment on Doctor Malone's work to note a striking angularity in the outlines of many of his American saints, a harshness of personal and spiritual contour which, at times, makes the application of the term "saint" seem an incongruity. Comparison with the mellow annals of old world saintliness, which give the word its connotations, are unavoidable. One is hard put to it, for example, to imagine a roadside shrine to Charles B. Aycock, or Susan B. Anthony in stained glass. It is evident that a society expresses itself as well through its saints as through its heroes, its houses, or its laws. And the occasional grittiness of Doctor Malone's list simply calls to mind that the people from which it was drawn faced, until recently, a number of bold and broad frontiers.

Nevertheless, America has known grace and tenderness. James includes as one of his "fundamental inner conditions" of saintliness, "a shifting of the emotional centre towards loving and harmonious affections, towards 'yes, yes,' and away from 'no,' where the claims of the nonego are concerned." It is almost presumptuous for one man to consider applying such a measurement to the life of another. But one wonders if a slightly more radiant gallery might not have resulted if Doctor Malone had pressed that test with greater force upon his candidates.

JOHN FINCH.

Dartmouth College.

Our Knowledge of God. By JOHN BAILLIE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.

THE author gave several years to the teaching of theology in Canada and the

United States. Since his return to Edinburgh a steady stream of American students has sought his classroom. Yet no one could ever think of this book as other than the ripest fruitage of Scottish Christian scholarship. Its assurance that the most profound theology will command interest, its easy mastery of the various schools of philosophy, its assumption of a reader's acquaintance with the Greek, Latin, German and other languages, are characteristic hallmarks. If it be said that the practical demands of American religious life leave no time for such scholarly pursuits, it may be commented whether anything less can panoply us with a full supporting religious faith.

The central contention of the volume is that all men have some knowledge of the transcendent holy God and in some sense believe in Him. This universal experience is the most important of human verities and one that is not validated by argument. It is never a surprise conclusion greeting us at the end of our reasoning, but rather a recognition of that which prompted the beginning of our reasoning. It constitutes upon our lives a claim so sovereign that the attempt to deny it discloses within us a sense of sin and shame, and thus is initiated the sequence, ever extending itself as the revelation of the divine nature becomes deeper and fuller, of confession, repentance, forgiveness, reconciliation and the new life of fellowship. This is what we mean by religion, and the author beautifully describes how it began for him in the spiritual climate of the home into which he was born.

We can be too intellectualistic in our interpretation of the Christian faith as, indeed, were the authors of the Westminster Confession. We are not so much to validate it by argument as we are to bring it to a consciousness of itself by our mode of living. We have been too ready to assume that the modern man has devel-

oped an immunity against the appeal of the gospel. They whom Jesus rebuked for their lack of faith were not men who denied God with the top of their minds (a favorite expression of the author) but men who while apparently incapable of doubting God, live as though He does not exist. The wicked man is not he who is beset with intellectual perplexity, but the evader who attempts to persuade himself that he can go through life with his wickedness and yet escape divine judgment.

No New Testament text better sums up its whole message than the saying of Saint Paul—"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." The gospel is a demand made upon us, to be accepted as a gift. Primarily we are not asked to do anything about it in our own strength, but to let God do something for us. To be sure, all our knowledge of God is given us in, with, and under our knowledge of one another, and with the world as its ground. Thus a large place in religion is open to moral obligation.

Readers of this volume are likely to come out thinking more of Tillich and Temple than of Barth, Otto, Aquinas or even of Brunner. Readers of Doctor Baillie's former books will be interested to note where and how his own mind is growing.

The size and importance of this book will grow upon its student. I think of it as the most important religious book of the year. Its evangelical emphasis leaves nothing to be desired. "It is not as the result of an inference of any kind, whether explicit or implicit, whether laboriously excogitated or swiftly intuited, that the knowledge of God's reality comes to us. It comes rather through our direct personal encounter with Him in the Person of Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord."

JOHN W. LANGDALE.
Book Editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Flowering of Mysticism. By RUFUS M. JONES. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

WHENEVER a man continues to dream through a well-rounded life of having time some day to write a book into which he can put his best thought and findings upon a dearly beloved subject, he is quite likely to issue at last a volume of high value. Dr. Rufus Jones has done something like that in *The Flowering of Mysticism*.

Mysticism itself is a term impossible of a satisfying definition—one of those terms which are understood best by being defined not too closely. The personal foibles and pathological characteristics of many minor mystics, and the curious aberrations which we find in studying this subject, may hide from us the essential glory of mysticism itself. For in mysticism the spirit of man made by God and for God, is striving to find its Home again—and sometimes on opinions which the world can never comprehend. Doctor Jones himself knows and admits the peculiar pitfalls of mysticism. Indeed he warns against a too intense attempt to isolate it. In this respect mysticism must be treated as the great mystic, Meister Eckhart, did the concept of God. "If I had a God I could 'know,'" he said—he meant as a finite object—"I would have him for my God no longer."

On the other hand, it has been said that there can be no religion without mysticism. Certainly there is a New Testament mysticism, an indefinable "otherness" to Christianity which the crasser materialistic mind that quite often takes over the management of affairs in the Church has failed to appreciate. Mysticism is not, of course, to be equated with Christianity, and in fact, is not so much a factor in the Christian equation as a manifestation of one of its processes. What puts the pragmatic mind of the day

against mysticism, almost by reflex action, has been the pathological manifestations of it—dreams, visions, ecstatic states, and the like. All of this has indeed had a tendency to discount mysticism and all its ways and works, for we live in a very practical world where immediacy is a cult and pragmatism a philosophy. Doctor Jones insists, however: "There is a type of ecstatic state, of inspiration and illumination, which seems to me to be a most glorious attainment and very near to the goal of life—a state of concentration, of unification, of liberation, of discovery, of heightened and intensified powers, and, withal, a burst of joy, of rapture, and of radiance." One cannot read that sentence without feeling that something has been said rather well for the pro-ecstatic side.

Why the fourteenth century should have seen an unusual flowering of the human spirit not only in mysticism but in many other ways, no one can fully explain. Perhaps it was because the medieval night was far spent, the day was at hand. Perhaps, as Doctor Jones suggests, the human spirit was finding itself unbearably cramped in many directions. The Church had crystallized into a ritualistic, mechanistic rigidity not far removed from *rigor mortis*. The Crusades had spent their force, the Renaissance had not quite sent the first red streamers of coming day above the horizon. Cathedral building had either ceased, or was at best touching too small a number clustered here and there in the far separate localities where the gigantic "prayers in stone" were being erected. The modern tides of enlistment for social well-being and community welfare were undreamed of. No idea of making this world the New Jerusalem had yet flashed definitely upon the mind of man. What else was left for the pious to do than to cultivate their own spiritual resources? Once the truth has been fully

apprehended that God is not far away but within one's own heart—what more natural than the attempt to meet and find Him *there*? So the mystic strove and practiced daily a regimen of prayer, meditation, physical punishment, and the like which would be unthinkable today. Furthermore, mystic reacted upon mystic, and while Germany, especially the Rhine Valley, was the center of this radiant life, as Doctor Jones says, "Italy, France, England, the Netherlands, and Switzerland—all felt the fresh spiritual life bloom forth as though a vernal equinox."

A world of research has gone into *The Flowering of Mysticism*. Its best mission will be to furnish the modern reader with a view of life and thought as this was manifest among some extraordinary Christians in an age which we usually pass over for the more dynamic centuries before and after it. The modern age, however, would be improved if it could have more than a memory of the individualistic piety of those long dead Rhenish Christians. In their own way they were telling us that it is the soul that is immortal, not the social order. Is it not time we were learning it?

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR.
Greene Memorial Methodist Church,
Roanoke, Virginia.

Five Decades and a Forward View.
By JOHN R. MOTT. New York:
Harper & Brothers. \$1.50.

DELIVERED first as the Sprunt Foundation Lectures for 1939 at the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia, the seven chapters of this small but important new book by Doctor Mott are devoted to some of the principal developments in the world mission of Christianity during the successive decades of the half century covered by his unique service in the leadership of many great religious enterprises.

The first five chapters review in suc-

cession some significant aspect of each decade. Here in brief compass is something that goes far beyond a historical record of the major movements that have marked the extension of Christianity in our time; there is interpretation and prophetic guidance out of that experience which gives practical help for decades yet to come.

The first chapter on "The Student Missionary Uprising" is devoted mainly to the founding and spread through the late eighties and the nineties of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. Doctor Mott believes that this Movement is more needed in the period just ahead than ever before, with such revision of program as the times demand.

The Layman's Missionary Movement is the central theme of the chapter dealing with the first decade of this century. He asks if steps should not be taken to constitute this Movement in a new form, perhaps as an effective federation of the various denominational laymen's missionary organizations.

The decade of the World War opened with the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh. An impressive chapter on "Drawing Together Missionary Forces" tells of the founding of the International Missionary Council and the National Christian Councils which grew out of that epoch-making gathering. The world Christian movement now calls for an advanced stage of co-operation in which, Doctor Mott says, "the forces related to the missionary enterprise pool not only knowledge and experience but also plans in the making, personalities, funds, administration and at times, it may be, names and identity."

In a characteristic chapter on "Liberating the Money Power," Doctor Mott draws some sober lessons from the financial history of the postwar decade. It includes one of the most penetrating

analyses of the Interchurch World Movement yet made by any officer who carried large responsibility in its organization, and points valuable lessons for those venturing in future upon plans for co-operative enterprises.

The period of the thirties is covered in a chapter entitled "Depression, Recession, Re-Creation." Doctor Mott states that in this critical decade there have been more competent minds enlisted in the study of the Christian enterprise than ever before and he gives an impressive summary of the new leadership which has arisen to carry the churches of the world forward into their great time of testing.

The closing chapters "Looking Ahead from Madras" and "The Leadership for the Coming Day" present with utmost seriousness the unprecedented situation in which the world mission must now go forward.

The strength of the Christian faith held by the churches that have been established over the world through the missions of modern times is one of the dominant impressions which Doctor Mott puts forward with great vigor in these closing pages. As he came away from the Madras Conference it was with the conviction that "were Christianity to die out in Europe or America—which God forbid!—it exists in such vitality and propagating power in certain fields of Asia, Africa, and the island world that, sooner or later, it would spread to our shores and reestablish itself."

FRANKLIN D. COGSWELL,
Secretary, Educational Division,
Missionary Education Movement.

Paul, Man of Conflict. By DONALD W. RIDDLE. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

THE time has come, says Professor

Riddle, to write a life of Paul which makes no effort to fit his career into the framework of Luke-Acts, which he deems a very skillful and artistic narrative, but not a primary source for history.

One needs only to look at the last chapter of Luke's Gospel and the first chapter of his Acts to see that Professor Riddle is right in saying that Luke is not fastidious about chronology; for the last chapter of the Gospel suggests that Jesus ascended at the end of the day when He first appeared to the disciples, while he states in the Acts that Jesus appeared to them during the space of forty days before His ascension. But may it not be true that Luke is all the better as a historian because he is indifferent to time sequences and certain other details and devotes himself to giving a vivid impression of the general movement and the more significant crises?

However, Professor Riddle's constant repudiation of Acts as a reliable source, and his concentration on the epistles, give his book an unconventional freshness. It is well phrased, easy to read, and one gets to the end before he knows it.

Paul, he says, was a sensitive child, and his attempt to keep the law involved him in painful inner conflicts. His persecution of the Christians was an attempt to gain peace by the fiercest loyalty to Judaism. The outcome of this conflict was that "somewhere near Damascus, of which city Paul at that time may have been a resident, he had an experience in which he believed that he saw Jesus, and he interpreted this as meaning that God had revealed His Son in Him." Professor Riddle has not removed his hat in the presence of this scene.

His description of the reasons for the violent opposition to Paul is very suggestive. It was not primarily his theology, but more particularly his departure from Jewish religious habits, which for the

mass of the people were the main thing in Judaism. Another reason for the opposition of both Jew and Gentile was what Professor Riddle calls Paul's spiritualism. Men were repelled by him just as many people today would be repelled by a member of one of the Pentecostal sects, or even by a fashionably gowned Oxford Grouper who felt that she was constantly guided by the Spirit.

Paul, says Doctor Riddle, in the exalted place which he gave to Jesus came dangerously near violating the principle of the divine unity so characteristic of Judaism. The cosmic significance which he gave to Jesus arose from the eschatology with which he was permeated. Yet at the same time Doctor Riddle suggests that Paul did not believe in the Virgin Birth, for in Romans he says that Jesus was born of the seed (sperm) of David according to the flesh.

Referring to such passages as 2 Corinthians 10-12 and the Epistle to the Galatians, he describes Paul as harsh and recriminating; he deemed failure to agree with him as persecution. While we cannot agree with this description of Paul's attitude toward the Corinthians, we must admit that his description of the conditions in Corinth is exceedingly good.

Professor Riddle regards the end of Paul's life as unspeakably pathetic, because Jesus whom he had constantly expected had not come, and hence, says he, "we may imagine him at the end saying, as later men imagined Jesus to have said, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" It may easily be that Paul, like his Master, had moments of this kind, but it also may easily be that we have in the words of Second Timothy a true fragment from Paul, when he says: "At my first defence no one took my part, but all forsook me. . . . But the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me . . . and I

was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen."

ROLLIN H. WALKER.
Ohio Wesleyan University.

Highland Shepherds. By ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$2.00.

Where My Caravan Has Rested. By BURRIS JENKINS. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$2.00.

Highland Shepherds, a "Book of the Rural Pastorate," has high distinction. Although Doctor Hewitt, who is now principal of Montpelier Seminary and president of Vermont Junior College, has had a varied and rich experience, the particular phase of his biography which would convince the reader of his qualifications for the writing of this particular work is the fact that he was minister of a single rural parish for more than twenty-five years. Yet the fact that he can write exceptionally sprightly, colorful, virile English is not to be counted against him. His style never drowses or drags. The book compels attention, and in sheer interest it ranks high in the field of homiletics.

The entire setting is rural but the problems with which Doctor Hewitt deals are applicable to all aspects of ministerial life. The four chapters on the art of preaching are to an unusual degree original, practical and thought-provoking. Dr. George H. Palmer once named "audacity" as one of the crowning virtues of speech and writing. In this volume that linguistic merit is exemplified again and again. Its fresh and spontaneous humor tempts one who has reached the last page to begin again at the beginning and repeat the journey. Occasionally we are a little bit dubious about the correctness of certain unanno-

tated allusions. For example, just why should the worn-out aphorism about few conversions occurring after the first half-hour be attributed to Whitefield? But there is no doubt that *Highland Shepherds* is a book scintillating in style and rich in content.

In one of the chapters in his book, *American Preachers of Today*, Dr. Edgar Dewitt Jones, after commenting on the fact that clergymen in the mass are pretty much the same as their brethren of other vocations with here and there "a virile personality, aggressive, fearless and unbroken by the dead hand of tradition," adds, "To this last-named group, small in the nature of things, belongs Burris Atkins Jenkins of Kansas City." The autobiography of such a personality will not fit into any of our well-worn grooves. In our attempts to understand personalities most of us are inclined to commit the intellectual sin of labeling, but the reader of the life story of Burris Jenkins will have a hard time to do this. When he has about concluded that he has the proper label for this dynamic Kansas City preacher, he discovers that it is entirely wrong and looks for another.

Where My Caravan Has Rested is an exceptionally frank piece of autobiographical writing. Few lives have been unbroken successes but most autobiographies have nothing to say about failures. Doctor Jenkins, however, unhesitatingly records his defeats as well as his victories. One of the unforgettable chapters of the book is the struggle of the young man of broken health in his first pastorate from which he was driven by an intense, legalistic, gray-bearded elder. The chapters on "The College Caravan" and "Yale and Harvard" should be required reading for all college professors. "A Flyer in Education" and "The Bluegrass Region" tell of the author's experiences as president of Butler College and Transylvania

University. He speaks of his stay in the bluegrass as the happiest period of his life up to that time, although he was vigorously attacked by those who spoke another language theologically. By this time he was suffering severely from what a German physician had diagnosed as *Rheumatismus, Gicht*, a trouble which eventually necessitated his going on the operating table twenty-two times. Yet probably the most important part of this autobiography is the modest account of the distinguished and fruitful pastorate of the Linwood Community Church in Kansas City. Doctor Jenkins has been characterized as "first, last and all the time a preacher." He is unique both in his profession and as a personality. It would be hard to imagine such a man writing an autobiography which is not good reading.

LEWIS H. CHRISMAN.
West Virginia Wesleyan College.

The New England Mind. The Seventeenth Century. By PERRY MILLER. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.75.

DOCTOR MILLER has laid out for himself a piece of work which, when completed with the industry and brilliancy which characterize the laying of the foundation-courses in this initial volume, will command the respect and admiration of scholars, and reward the careful study of all who are interested in the ideas which have largely influenced the development of American institutions and American national character. For in New England, in the first three generations, when it was actually "100 per cent English," were planted seeds which bore rich fruitage long after Puritanism had lost its totalitarian authority in the little commonwealths which made up the New England of the seventeenth century. It is the intellectual history of the Puritan

mind that the author concerns himself with. The "mind"—mark the word! Others may busy themselves with the picturesque personalities of that day, and with the work which sturdy lay empire-builders were patiently doing in the valleys of the Connecticut, the Merrimac and the Penobscot, at the hazard of tomahawk and scalping-knife. There is no lack of material for them. And much of it has been utilized in poetry, historical romances and the now popular romantic history. But Doctor Miller refuses to be drawn aside into those pleasant fields. Ideas are his quarry, and the scent sometimes takes him far afield. He regards the Puritan mind as largely a transplantation, and he shows us the plant in full flower in the Old Country in that century of the Great Migration. He shows moreover that the Old World roots of some of its basic theological concepts reach back through twelve Christian centuries to Augustine of Hippo himself.

One gathers that the source-materials of this impressively scholarly treatise have been gleaned from the indefatigable perusal of hundreds, perhaps thousands of discourses delivered by Puritan divines on Thanksgiving and Fast days, on Election days, at the opening of the Great and General Court of Massachusetts, or by Thomas Hooker, the noblest Roman of them all, from his Hartford pontifical throne. Harvard baccalaureates and commencement pieces have been searched for the ideas which they reveal. Even the thin and uninspired poetry which would break out in spite of the bleakness of the prevailing atmosphere, like trailing arbutus blooming in the snow, has been analyzed for what it can yield to make the composite portrait of "The New England Mind." Probably Perry Miller's fingers are the first to turn the dusty leaves of those ancient tracts since the late Henry M. Dexter, historian of New England

Congregationalism, left his finger-prints upon them: Would that he were here to review and enjoy this production of his worthy successor! Not many contemporary Church historians can bring to such a task the equipment which Dr. Dexter possessed in an eminent degree, and to which the present reviewer makes no pretensions.

The work falls into four divisions: I. Religion and Learning; II. Cosmology; III. Anthropology; and IV. Sociology. With some temerity your reviewer ventures to suggest that there is in existence a considerable body of material which can scarcely be considered as wholly foreign to this study, but which appears to have been left out of account, perhaps for good reason. For, though the Mathers, the Hookers, the Cottons and the Wigglesworths were more articulate and possessed undoubted advantages in getting their ideas into print for the edification of future scholars, there were scores of other scribes, goose-quill in hand, secretaries of legislatures, town clerks, and even private correspondents, who were setting down their thoughts and recording the thoughts and resolves and actions of other men, usually laymen. Probably to a greater extent than has been the case in any other section of the country these records and letters of the secular Puritans have been printed. Is it rash to assume that here, also, a scholar working with the same zeal and industry of which this illuminating work is evidence, might bring to light additional facts?

Though not altogether easy reading, except for specialists, this work will nevertheless reward careful study; best of all it is likely to whet the appetite for the volumes which are to follow—at not too long an interval, we trust.

JAMES RICHARD JOY.
New York City.

Along the Indian Road. By E. STANLEY JONES. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

THE INDIAN ROAD has lost none of its fascination for E. Stanley Jones. In the current record of his most recent journeys up and down this far-flung, heavily-thronged highway of humanity, the author has not descended to the level of repetition from the contents of his earlier writings. There is a freshness and vivacity in his approach that delivers him from any just charge of merely ringing the changes upon former observations and reflections. It is truly a new pilgrimage that he has been making upon an Ancient Road, to be sure, but not without its startling changes. Stanley Jones' fidelity to the realisms of the old thoroughfare as he first saw it, is coupled with a high degree of insight into emerging idealisms and achievements, and a pleasing portrayal of the high lights and shadows of the teeming Orient, whether as a colorful bazaar, a bleak and unending panorama of villages, or a mass of mankind slowly but surely moving toward the light.

Along the Indian Road is not dull reading. It genuinely glows! His traditional blending of indefatigable industry, simplicity, sincerity, and spiritual purpose has not failed the artist in the creation of this new canvas. Stanley Jones is at his best, however, whether on the platform or upon the pages of a book, when he radiates an evangelical earnestness. His frank confession, in the introduction to the volume, that he goes into many bypaths, is illuminated by the fact that at the close is the goal which in his favorite term of "conversion to Christ" he declares is both the goal and center of his life and of this book. The volume does not belie his profession. It is still "Christ of the Indian Road," and "Christ of Every Road" with whom he invites us to walk.

It may be surprising to some that Stan-

ley Jones felt his need of decided personal adjustment in this fresh journey along the Indian Road. The record of those adjustments is refreshing reading. They do him real credit as does, also, his frank facing of the facts of non-Christian faiths. The criticisms, and even calumnies, which have been showered upon him from some quarters for "surrendering the faith" are a clear indication of an aggravated case of spiritual strabismus on the part of his critics. Christ and His gospel are the unmistakable and unchangeable core of his faith and life. His appraisal of Gandhi today is both sympathetic and discriminating, and while he believes that "the little brown man" has missed, in its fulness, the final Way, he gives him a deathless place in the making of history. In his comments upon the Church, which are both sensitive and critical, and which are saved from being strictures by his innate devotion to his spiritual mother, and in his sharpening of the distinctions between the Church and the Kingdom of God, the author is following what to many is a tangential pathway. His "branch unity plan," which he presented so forcefully across America in the National Preaching Mission, and which he enforces in this volume, has not struck fire even with many who share his solicitude for a deepening Kingdom-emphasis.

Stanley Jones gives a good account of the continuance and growth of the Christian Ashram Movement, if one may dare to speak in the same breath of things so opposite as an Eastern Ashram and a Western movement. Our contemporary discussion group method is quite anemic in contrast with the sharing that takes place in an Ashram. So, also, are the highly organized and spectacular mass meetings, stressing confession and sharing, that are being industriously promoted and publicized across the land. Already the Ashram is being transplanted to the United

States under the aegis of the forthcoming National Christian Mission. It will need to be very skillfully and tenderly cultivated, lest it shrivel in our soil and under our climate, and with our high-pressure handling.

In his concluding chapter, Stanley Jones rises to the heights of his noble best. He is never so forceful, so winsome and so persuasive as when he is presenting Christ as a revolutionary, redemptive power in the lives of men. He leaves no shadow of doubt upon what he believes and knows that Christ can do, and therefore in an honest and vital, although imperfect way, Christianity can do, and does. In his final words, as indeed all through the pages of this vital Christian document, he reveals the missionary, churchman, social philosopher, apologete and evangelist all united in one lovable, luminous soul, with whom we rejoice to continue to walk along the contemporary way, and with whom, at the feet of his Master and ours, we are inspired afresh to sit, as his fellow disciples, fearlessly and faithfully fronting our world—the world for which that divine Master died and rose again.

WILLIAM HIRAM FOULKES.
Old First Church,
Newark, New Jersey.

The White Man's Burden. By
WILLIAM PATON. London: The
Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

Liberality and Civilization. By GIL-
BERT MURRAY. New York: The
Macmillan Company. \$1.00.

The Idea of a Christian Society.
By T. S. ELIOT. New York: Har-
court, Brace & Company. \$1.50.

HERE are three small books written by three separate authors. They have different themes, and although they were written independently, and with no collaboration, they have much in common,

and it is fitting that they be reviewed together in a single article. They are books for our times; they are serious attempts to discover what is wrong with the world, and to chart the way we must go, not only to avoid disaster, but what is even more important, to conserve the hard-earned cultural and spiritual values of the past. One of the volumes has been manhandled by its critics, but no matter how much we may disagree with the authors of these three books, the present reviewer is certain that each of these men has some words of wisdom for our day which must be seriously followed if we would avoid catastrophe.

The first book is written by a man with a long and honored connection with the World Missionary Work of the Christian Church. In dealing with this old ideal called "The White Man's Burden," he admits that it has often been but a thinly disguised pretense to cover the white man's ruthless exploitation of backward races. Greater significance is given to this important theme by the historical fact that it has been at the bottom of the experience of the British nation in its course of empire during the last two centuries. Doctor Paton lifts "The White Man's Burden" idea into the highest realm, and holds that, "The governing of these peoples, judged unable yet to stand alone in the modern world, should be carried on as a sacred trust of civilization, in the interests of the people themselves." He calls for a closer relating of the work of governing the peoples of Asia and Africa to the spirit, message, and work of that spiritual fellowship of men called the Christian Church. This is a salutary and constructive message for an age of disillusionment; it is statesmanlike in its approach, and will exert a profound influence upon English-speaking peoples. It is a message to be read again and again, and pondered carefully.

In the second book Gilbert Murray makes a sharp distinction between liberality and liberalism. He says that liberalism is democracy and civilization gone wild down the pathway of lawlessness, license and self-will. Liberality, as the author sees it, is nothing more nor less than Christianity. He puts a staggering challenge to our civilization in these words, "The great civilization, perhaps the greatest there has ever been, unparalleled in material resources, professing for the most part Christian principles, is still staggering under the blow of 1914 to 1918 and threatened with more deadly blows still. It can save itself. It knows the right way and has bound itself by treaties to follow it. But has it the will power, the conscience, the vitality? Is it a living tree capable of putting forth new branches and strong ones after its great wound, or is it for the most part dead wood that, once broken, stays broken permanently?" And with passionate urgency he calls, "Against the awful weight of blind tradition and bewildering selfishness let us throughout Europe who believe in liberality and are free in thought and speech see that our eyes are open and our consciences alert; let us see that, under repeated disappointments, our sane courage does not fail us, till we or our children can at last, throughout the world, bring to men of good will peace and brotherhood." The events of the last four or five months on the continent of Europe but serve to further emphasize the importance and relevance of this splendid little book.

In many respects Mr. Eliot's book is the best of the three. He has been accused of playing to the Fascists, of having hazy and impractical ideas of what a Christian society is, and of standing for a State dominated by the Church. There may be some statements made by the author that would justify such an opinion, but

a careful reading will not blind our eyes to the real and positive message that the book contains, and it is there plainly to be discerned for him who would see it. Mr. Eliot believes that the Christian of today is "becoming more and more de-Christianized by all sorts of unconscious pressure," and who can truthfully deny it? He thinks there are "profound differences between pagan and Christian society," and opines that "A Christian society only becomes acceptable after you have fairly examined the alternatives." Mr. Eliot performs a real service to the people of Britain and America when he observes, "Our newspapers have done all they could with the Red Herring of the German National Religion, an eccentricity which is after all no odder than some cults held in Anglo-Saxon countries: this German National Religion is comforting in that it persuades us that we have a Christian civilization; it helps us disguise the fact that our aims, like Germany's, are materialistic. And the last thing we should like to do would be to examine Christianity which in such contexts as this, we say we keep." Well on to the end he says, "Instead of merely condemning Fascism and Communism, we might do well to consider that we also live in a mass civilization following many wrong ambitions and many wrong desires, and that if our society renounces completely its obedience to God, it will become no better, and possibly worse, than some of those abroad which are popularly execrated." This is not a popular thing to say in England today, and for this reason I think it is a brave book, uttered by a brave man, at a time when it is sorely needed. It is thought provoking, and should have the careful attention of religious and political leaders.

SIDNEY A. GUTHRIE.
First Methodist Church,
Galesburg, Illinois.

Bookish Brevities

The article by Chancellor Gray is one of two lectures given at Drew University under the Haddon-Colt Foundation.

The British Weekly reports that more books are sold in Finland, in proportion to the population, than anywhere else in the world. It is no uncommon thing to find men and women with university degrees working in quite humble occupations.

Lin Yu-Tang regards the discovery of one's favorite author as the most critical event in one's intellectual development. There is such a thing as the affinity of spirits, and among the authors of ancient and modern times, one must try to find an author whose spirit is akin with his own. Who is one's favorite author, no one can tell, probably not even the man himself. It is like love at first sight.

In his volume *The Idea of a Christian Society*, T. S. Eliot refers to the book *Germany's New Religion* (Abingdon Press) as a very interesting volume. In that book, Professor William Hauer claims this new religion to be an eruption from the biological and spiritual depths of the German nation, under the right of every new age to mold its own religious forms. We believe, adds Professor Hauer, that God has laid a great task to our nation, and that He has therefore revealed Himself especially in its history and will continue to do so.

They who can be interested in the allegation that Presbyterian, Congrega-

tional, Methodist and Baptist ministers are not truly ministers of Christ's Church will find an irenic but complete refutation of this assertion in *The Sacrament of Reunion* by Cyril C. Richardson (Charles Scribner's Sons, \$1.25). Out of abundant historical scholarship, this young author offers a lucid and convincing argument for the adoption of the proposed concordat between the Presbyterian and Protestant Episcopal Churches.

Into the writing of *My Hobby of the Cross* (Madeleine Sweeny Miller, Fleming H. Revell Company, \$2.00) has been poured the vintage of more than 100,000 miles of travel and the leisure time of ten years. Mrs. Miller vividly narrates how she came to discover the many crosses that compose her valued collection. Most of them come from remote and widely separated parts of the world, and she describes the scenery and history of their localities with abounding detail.

The evangelical emphasis is unmistakable; indeed, several of the chapters climax in the quotation of a verse of a popular gospel hymn. The book is handsomely made and printed, and the illustrations by J. Lane Miller are of unsurpassed beauty.

Competent persons have reviewed *The Clue to History* by John Macmurray (Harper and Brothers, \$2.50) as a very fine book. There are those who think that the author of *Creative Society* could write no other kind of a book. To this reader, it is a most baffling, tantalizing volume.

Not that it lacks brilliant elements. Consider these quotations.

"That all men are of one blood as the children of Adam is mere fact and can be found in the first two chapters of Genesis—what is new in the teaching of Jesus is that he lifts this fact of human brotherhood to the level of intention." "The nation which will have nothing to do with internationalism makes all political problems international." "Evil is the estrangement of man from God which manifests itself as an estrangement of man from man, so that the existence of enmity between human beings is the essence of sin." "The traditional habits of life upon which our civilization is based give rise to thought and reflection which prevent us from understanding the Christianity, which is the motive force behind the development of our civilization."

But consider these quotations.

"The Jews are the only people who have retained the capacity to think this world religiously. Jews were and are religious, while we are not. The answer to many questions is that the source of all the pressure towards progress, equality, freedom and common humanity is the Jew. Hitler and Mussolini, but Hitler increasingly, are the leaders, not of Germany and Italy, but of Western Europe. Hitler is clearly fascinated by the Jews and the violence of his expressed loathing is the expression of an inferior complex in face of it. The thought of the triumph of the Jewish consciousness casts Hitler into the depths of despair but fills me with joyous exhilaration. Hitler's declaration that the Jewish consciousness is poison to the Aryan races is the deepest insight the Western world has achieved into its own nature, and his capacity to realize this is the proof of his genius as well as the secret of his power and the curious fascination which his personality

exerts. Europe is beginning to realize that its central problem is the Jewish problem, and thereby links up the crisis of our civilization with the understanding of Christianity."

"The Christian Spirit is being developed in Soviet Russia to an extent that no other country has ever attempted, yet Soviet Russia repudiates Christianity and looks upon it as the enemy of human progress. Russia was able first to establish a socialist society, and to begin a new chapter in the history of the Christian intention in the world. Soviet Russia is the nearest approach to the realization of this Christian intention the world has yet seen, thus marking an immense advance in explicit and practical form in the progress that Jesus began. The conscious purpose of Soviet Russia is the establishment of a universal community, based upon equality and freedom, overreaching differences of nationality, race, sex and religion. The Fascist powers can force the democracies into action, but only into blind, self-destructive action. It is the inevitable destiny of Fascism to create what it purposes to prevent—the socialist commonwealth of the world."

The author of these unconvincing utterances is the Professor of the Philosophy of Mind and Logic at the University of London. He calls his first chapter "The Ambiguity of Christianity." Ambiguity could fittingly be a part of the title of the entire book.

R. BIRCH HOYLE

On Thursday, December 14th, R. Birch Hoyle died in a London hospital. He was the one regular contributor to *Religion in Life*, furnishing each quarter an appraisal of the theological books which appeared in Europe.

R. Birch Hoyle made his first impression on American readers by his article

on *The Holy Spirit* in Hastings' *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*. Thereafter he always thought of The Holy Spirit as being his particular field of study. Probably he did more than anyone else to introduce English readers to Barth and Brunner. For some years, he was a member of the faculty of the Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, a Baptist in a Presbyterian School, where he exercised a far-spread, quickening influence by his lectures and writings.

His religious literary activities were many-sided. He wrote four books, and his translations found a place in some of the best hymnals. It was, however, as a reviewer of religious books that he achieved pre-eminence. I am informed by R. Birch Hoyle's friend, Zia Bentley, that he outlined each book he read and applied to it three main canons of criticism: 1. What is the writer proposing to do? 2. Has he accomplished his task? 3. Was it worth-while in the contribution made to knowledge or faith? Doctor Hoyle read rapidly and had a tenacious memory. His wide acquaintance included men who were likely to be writing books. A working familiarity with Hebrew and the classical languages, with French, German, Italian and Spanish opened to him a far-ranging knowledge of contemporary theological writing. Perhaps a deafness, on account of which he never manifested any sense of handicap or asked for any concession, turned him to books with more avidity. His

grateful friends came to look for his frequent word—Watch for such and such a book soon to be published. Watch they did, for well they knew how complete was his mastery in measuring writing ability and the pertinency of a book in relation to current problems and live issues.

They who were privileged to know Doctor Hoyle as a table companion appreciate the tribute of his colleague, John A. Hutton, of the *British Weekly*, "I never knew anyone who exceeded him in the range and sum of his equipment as a Christian scholar, or in his swiftness to supply fitting knowledge about whatever issue was under consideration."

Doctor Hoyle liked to come to America and, despite his deafness, he received many invitations because of his ability to grip audiences of varying capacities. The war was on when he left us in September and he knew his boat was in danger of being torpedoed. He went unperturbed, as became a man acutely sensitive to daily events, but ever accustomed to the Eternal.

The last letter which came from R. Birch Hoyle to the editor of *Religion in Life* closed with the word, "With Christian greetings and an unshakable faith in God's control of the universe." And as Zia Bentley writes, "Now he is free to roam in the Celestial Bookshop and have it out with Aquinas and Calvin and to his delight meet Kierkegaard—whose *Purity of Heart* was the last book we discussed."